

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1903.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION IN ITS RELATIONS.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D.

(Concluded from Volume XXXII, page 486.)

## III.

### THE RELATION OF JUSTIFICATION TO THE MEANS OF GRACE.

In Article V of the Confession it is said: "For obtaining this grace God has instituted the office of preaching, and has given the Gospel and the sacraments, by which as by means, he gives the Holy Ghost, who works faith where and when he will, in those who hear the Gospel, which teaches that by the merit of Christ, not by our own merit, we have a gracious God, if we believe it." Or according to the Latin text: "That God not for the sake of our own merits, but for the sake of Christ justifies those who believe that for Christ's sake they are received into favor."

The clear implication, if not express declaration, is that in and of ourselves we do not have the faith that justifies. Such faith is wrought in us by the third person of the Trinity, but wrought through means that appeal to our rational and spiritual apprehension, viz., through the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments.

As these means are not identical in character, it is proper to consider each apart from the other.

VOL. XXXIII. No. 1. I

1. *The Word of God as means for working faith.*

The Word of God has always been regarded by Lutherans as the primary, the chief, the absolutely indispensable means of grace. The Word is not only the source of our knowledge of God in Christ Jesus, and of the promises of salvation, and of the way of salvation; but it is the special instrument of the Holy Ghost for working contrition and faith. As divinely revealed truth in the form of *law*, it exposes and convicts of sin, creates a sense of responsibility, and acquaints us with the fact of our moral impotence. In this preliminary way the law can be regarded as a means of grace. But it cannot by itself work faith. It finally works wrath and drives men to despair.

But as divinely revealed truth in the form of *Gospel*, as the revelation of God's love, and as the promise of pardon, the Word of God is especially the primary, the chief, the absolutely indispensable means of grace (Rom. 10 : 8); or it may be regarded as the chief instrument used by the Holy Ghost in leading men to appropriate the grace of God contained in the promises of the Gospel. As divinely revealed, and therefore authoritative truth, the Word is fitted to command the attention and respect of men. That it fails to do this in so many instances is not the fault of the Word itself. The reason must be sought in the darkened understanding and perverted moral sensibility.

As the Word of truth, this Word of God is taken by the Spirit of truth, who comprehends the deep things of God, and testifies to the spirit of man, as his instrument for illuminating the mind of man, for working in the recesses of man's heart, and for guiding him in the way of all truth. And it is in the form of the preached Word reflected through sanctified personality, and witnessed to by the experience of salvation, that it exerts its greatest power. Hence it can and must be said that "The chief means of grace in the Church is the Word of preaching, which through its testimony in regard to sin (Law) and in regard to grace (Gospel) is fitted to work the penitent obedience of faith, and to serve the Holy Ghost to that end in proportion as it is a true expression of the salvation in Christ,

that is, as it is scriptural."\* Christ himself was a preacher, and he commanded his apostles to go into all the world and preach the Gospel. On the day of Pentecost they founded the Church through preaching, and they regarded preaching as more important than baptizing (1 Cor. 1 : 17). Preaching was also the chief instrumentality by which the Church was kept from utter stagnation and spiritual deadness in the Middle Ages, and it was the mighty force that promoted the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

Luther declared that "the Word is an almighty power, so powerful a thing that it can do everything, achieve everything, bring Christ and the forgiveness of sins—we speak of the external Word preached orally by you and me." And it was especially this oral or preached Word, in distinction from the written Word, that Luther regarded as the Word of God. He says: "Faith comes out of preaching, and preaching from the Word of God." "God will give his Spirit to no one without the Word and the office of preaching, which he appointed solely to preach Christ." "Hence upon whom the office of preaching is bestowed, upon him is conferred the highest office in the Church. He may also baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, and discharge all pastoral duties, or if he do not thus wish he may abide in preaching alone, and leave to others baptism and other subordinate duties, as Christ did, and Paul, and all the apostles." He declared that "God has nothing to do with us, except through some means, and that is his Word." And from nothing did he pray more earnestly than to be delivered from dreams, visions, and angels. When he was attacked by the fanatics, who boasted of visions, dreams and revelations, and sought to instruct him, he replied: "I have not desired such revelations, and should they come before me, I would not believe them. I have earnestly prayed God to give me a true and clear knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. I have the Word. Therefore I know that I am in the right way, and that I cannot easily be deceived or fall into error."\*

\* Luthardt, *Dogmatik*, 10th ed., p. 341.

† Walch, 2 : 1919.

We thus see how our central Principle fixes our attention upon, and binds our thought to the Word of God as the instrument by which justifying faith is wrought in the heart, and as a means by which we are safeguarded against the vagaries and deceptions of men. He who would know the will of God in regard to his salvation must consult the Word of God; and he who would understand that word in its fullest import, and in its adaptation to his spiritual needs, must hear the voice and testimony of the believing ministry. It is to this end that God has instituted the office of public preaching and teaching in the Church; or as the *Form of Concord* states the matter: "For this reason God, through his infinite goodness and mercy, causes his divine and eternal law, and his marvelous counsel concerning our redemption, namely, the holy and saving Gospel concerning his eternal Son, our only Saviour and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, to be publicly preached. Through this preaching he gathers for himself an eternal Church from among the human race, and works in the hearts of men true repentance, the knowledge of sin, and genuine faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Again: "Through this instrument, namely, preaching and the hearing of the Word, God works in us, softens our hearts, draws man, so that through the preaching of the law he perceives his sins, and the wrath of God, and feels true fear, contrition and sorrow of heart. And through preaching and meditation on the Holy Gospel which promises the most gracious remission of sins in Christ, a spark of faith is kindled in him, he accepts the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake, and consoles himself with the promise of the Gospel; and thus the Holy Ghost, who works all these things, is sent forth into the heart"\* (Gal. 4 : 6).

It is thus true, as Thomasius says: "Justifying faith has its most immediate object in the Word of the Gospel, for it is especially faith in the promise of grace, in the testimony of God's grace in the preaching of Christ. But this object is likewise its *Principle*; for through it justifying faith arises in

\* *New Market Translation*, pp. 620-1.



the heart. The Word has called and enlightened the justified person. On the one hand it awoke in him the knowledge of sin, and a sense of the need of salvation; and on the other, a longing for salvation, and trust in the Saviour. If external events and circumstances have contributed to these ends, yet always was it the *Word* preached and heard that moved him to appropriate redemption."\*

In corroboration of this explanation of the genesis of faith we appeal to the experience of the Christian, who is distinctly conscious of the influence of the Word alone as the ruling factor in his conversion, according to Rom. 10 : 17 : "Faith cometh of hearing, and hearing by the Word of Christ." This "Word of Christ" works on the deepest principles of life, the spiritual intuitions, as over against the natural (psychical) susceptibilities, which are of the earth, earthly. As Law, this divine Word works contrition, which according to the Lutheran teaching is, if not a part of faith, at least one of its necessary presuppositions.† As Gospel, this divine Word works the *fides specialis*, by which each one believes that his own sins are pardoned for Christ's sake. Here now we have evangelical, that is, justifying faith, or justification by faith. This is our central Principle, but the principle of this Principle is the Word preached and read.

2. *The sacraments as means of grace.*

It is not in the words of our thesis (Art. V), neither is it taught anywhere in the Divine Word, that faith is wrought in its primary instance through a sacrament. It is not a doctrine of the Confessions, neither is it a teaching of the Scriptures, that infants receive faith through baptism, though "through baptism they are presented to God and become acceptable to him." In the thirteenth article, which treats of the *use of the sacraments*, it is said that "the sacraments are signs and testimonies of the will of God towards us, instituted for the purpose of exciting and strengthening faith in those who use them." It is not said that they were instituted for the purpose

\* *The Luth. Confession in the Consequence of its Principle*, p. 25.

† Müller's *Die Symb. Buecher*, Stuttgart, 1860, p. 615.

of working faith in its primary instance. But it is said that the sacraments "require" faith and are properly used when they are received by faith, and strengthen faith. "In the case of adults it is the *continuation, increase and sealing* of faith that is wrought through the sacraments, just as a person is said to acquire a thing when he daily obtains and acquires the continuation, special increase and sealing of that thing."\*

That the Holy Ghost is imparted through the Christian sacraments, and that he operates graciously through the sacraments, results from the fact that a sacrament is a *visible word*, a picture that signifies the same thing that is preached by the Word. Luther called the sacraments *efficacia gratiae signa*, and symbols that awake faith, signs and promises of the forgiveness of sins. In the Apology, sacraments are described as "external signs, which God has enjoined, and with which are connected the promise of grace." But a sacrament is not a mere sign. It is a rite, a ceremony, that embodies a fact, and a principle, inasmuch as its constituting, informing power is the divine word. *Verbum accedit ad elementum, et fit sacramentum*. The word added, however, is not primarily, much less exclusively, the word of institution. Augustine's oft quoted and much abused dictum is based on John 15 : 3,† and has reference to the Gospel in its broadest sense as the preaching of the Christian faith, which the receiver of the sacrament must believe. The great church Father does not in any sense speak here of the Lord's Supper, though doubtless the principle of the word added holds in regard to this sacrament as it does in regard to baptism. As a visible word, a sign, a seal, a symbolized truth, the sacrament is well fitted to work on the imagination of the intelligent receiver, and to enlist that powerful faculty in the interest of the gospel; and as by the very words of institution the truth is directed to the individual, the sacrament is specially adapted to impress the individual with the fact that the Lord comprehends him in the number of the elect ones; though it is by no means to be conceded that the Word

\* Carpzov, *Isagoge*, p. 249.

† Migne, *Patrologia*, XXXV, p. 1840.

preached is addressed only to all promiscuously, and to no one in particular. On the contrary, the Word directs its message also to each individual. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." "Whosoever will let him come."

Moreover, it is only through the Word read and spoken, that the sacraments become intelligible, and can act as instruments for imparting the Holy Ghost. For until the Word, in the broad sense of the divine message of salvation, and of the revelation of grace on account of Jesus Christ, has been proclaimed and inculcated, and even spiritually apprehended, the sacraments remain dark enigmas. This is implied in the order of the Catechism: First the Law, then the Gospel, then the Christian Experience, and then the Sacraments—first the sacrament of initiation, and then the sacrament of confirmation. But "without the operation of the Word in creating faith, the relation in which baptism places a person remains purely an objective one, and the gift, which it puts into the heart, remains a treasure hid in a field. Without the appropriating personal faith, despite baptism and the Lord's Supper, there results no personal justification, and the sacramental mediation of grace is gradually withdrawn without being able to unfold its blessings, or it finally becomes a judgment upon the recipient. Hence the Word holds the chief place in the economy of salvation. If anyone be deprived of the sacrament not by his own fault, he can be in some way saved by grace through faith alone."\*

The priority and superiority thus accorded to the Divine Word as means of grace, as compared with the sacraments, is fully justified by the Divine Word itself, which is represented not merely as a guide to salvation, but as a creative power of God for salvation to all who believe it (Rom. 1 : 16) as spirit and life (John 6 : 63), as an incorruptible seed, through which men are born again (Peter 1 : 23); as the bread by which man lives (Matt. 4 : 4); as the sword of the Spirit by which the world is to be overcome (Eph. 6 : 17; Heb. 4 : 12; Rev. 19 :

\* Thomasius, *Person und Werk*, II, 358.

15). Behind this Word stands God himself, and through it he speaks to us, and treats with us. It must result therefore that wherever the Word of God is preached, it becomes a savour from death unto death, or a savour from life unto life (2 Cor. 2 : 4-16). It is the great deciding means of grace.

No such creating, life-giving, conquering power is ascribed to the sacraments. In the entire twenty-one epistles, which are intended to expound the Gospel to the churches or to individuals, scarcely a dozen references are made to baptism; and Paul declares that Christ did not send him to baptize, but to preach the Gospel (1 Cor. 1 : 17); and in all these same epistles only a few verses of one are devoted to an exposition of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 10 : 16-18 ; 11 : 23-26). It is evident therefore that the Church has given a prominence to the sacraments as means of grace not warranted by the New Testament; and it is a demonstrated fact of history that this excess of prominence given to sacraments has wrought against "the eternal principle of Christianity." Too much and too often has the Church exalted the virtue and efficacy of sacraments at the expense of repentance and faith; nor is the Lutheran Church entirely free from this condemnation. Nevertheless, as instituted and ordered by the Lord, the sacraments dare not be overlooked, since they are the ordinary, but by no means the absolutely necessary, way to salvation; nor is grace necessarily bound objectively to the administration of the sacraments. *Crede et manducasti* is a commonplace in Lutheran teaching. And it was the distinct and unvarying teaching of the Lutheran Reformers, and it is likewise the teaching of the Lutheran Confessions, that sacraments are *subordinate* to the Word—to "the Word of God preached and heard," as Rohnert says; and the old Lutheran teaching laid heavy emphasis on repentance and faith. The Word works repentance and faith. The sacraments require repentance and faith as the conditions of their saving efficacy.

Through these two kinds of means, the Word and the Sacraments, which bear relation to each other as *primary and secondary*, the Holy Ghost works faith in those who hear the Gospel, and

use the sacraments aright, that is, with faith in the promise of grace. Hence it can be said that faith, looked at from the side of the divine instruments through which it is wrought by a divine Agent, is the gift of God. It does not originate in the natural man, because the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, neither can he know them. As trust in the promises of the Gospel, as confidence of heart in Him who is the Heart of the Gospel, it is a supernatural energy created by the Spirit of God, who takes the things of Christ and shows them to men, and causes men to understand their supernatural import, and to be convinced of their reality as the supreme good, and then by the application of motives leads them to surrender themselves to the conviction that the grace of God contains and offers the highest good; and when this conviction is followed by the high resolve to surrender ourselves to God in love and obedience we have Christianity in the living experience of salvation.

But this conviction, wrought by the Holy Ghost through means, is not a mere passivity. It is the 'highest intellectual, spiritual and moral energy of which the soul is capable; and the resolve to surrender is the soul's own act. Under the conviction, wrought by a supernatural power, but wrought in a rational and free agent, capable of arresting or promoting the progress of the conviction, the hearer of the Gospel assents to the heavenly message as true in general, and then consents to it as true for himself in particular.

This is that confidence of the heart, that *fides specialis*, that appropriates the merits, benefits and satisfaction of Christ, and that at the same time renews the heart, and gives beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. By the "grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Ghost," the hearer of the Gospel is led to believe in God as his Father, and to accept Christ as his Saviour. In this way God's sovereignty is upheld—"Where and when he will"—and man's freedom of volition as known in consciousness and in the experience of salvation, is sacredly guarded. The hearer of the Gospel message has *repented*, and

has *turned again*, and has *believed on the Lord Jesus Christ*. Hence faith is the gift of God; and it is also an act of personal self-determination, so that the Christian can say: "I am saved by grace," and Christ can say: "Thy faith hath saved thee" (Luke 7 : 50). Under the "grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Ghost" there is spiritual origination in man, as over against the carnal (Gr. psychical) sensibility.

"Where then is the glorying? It is excluded. By what manner of law? Of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law" (Rom. 3 : 27-28).

Works are excluded. Faith is the instrument, the *organon apprehensivum*, the open hand, by which the illumined and quickened soul lays hold on the grace of God. But in the final decision it is the soul itself that opens the hand and receives the gift of God. Faith has its law, and that law includes the act of choice. And inasmuch as faith lays hold on the grace of God in Christ it may be called the *causa instrumentalis* of Justification. But at the same time that faith appropriates the righteousness of Christ it fills the subject of justification with the grace of Christ, unites the subject of grace with the Object of grace, forms the root of a new life, and directs the entire human personality in the way of the Lord. "For ye are all the sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3 : 26).

#### IV.

##### THE RELATION OF JUSTIFICATION TO THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

1. It must never be forgotten that Justification has a subjective as well as an objective side. The believer is not only declared *justus*, but is *justus*, and is rightly called *holy*, not indeed because he is freed from all taint of sin, but because a life of holiness has been begun in him. He is generically a saint. He must be classed with those who have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb (Rev. 7 : 14). "As many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on

his name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John 1 : 12-13).

This divine birth is the inseparable attendant of Justification, which is not only the forgiveness of sins and adoption into sonship, but is a principiant forgiveness that acts on man's ethical nature, and makes him righteous, because it brings the renewing of the Holy Ghost and the living Christ into the heart. Hence the order of salvation is, *first*, Justification, and, *then*, Regeneration. In one place in the Apology Melancthon, seemingly at least, identifies the two. But the *Form of Concord* sets them in proper relation, and clearly distinguishes the one from the other. The reverse order could not be reconciled with the unquestioned Lutheran principle that we are justified by faith alone, without merits, works or righteousness of our own. The reverse order would also involve the absurdity that God regenerates a sinner before he justifies him, that is, while he is under condemnation. But it is involved in the whole Lutheran conception of Justification that God's work for man precedes God's work in man. God must pardon a man's sins, and give the assurance of his love, before the man can truly love God, and feel the new spiritual emotions of gratitude and love; for the former conditionates the latter, not only in the order of logical priority, but in the relation of cause and effect, just as thinking is prior to and the cause of thought. But as thought and thinking cannot be separated from each other in fact, so Regeneration and Justification cannot in fact be separated from each other. Where the one is, the objective fact, there the other is, the subjective experience. Where the pardon of sin is, the work of God for us, there Regeneration is, the work of God in us, the result inseparable from the cause, and a sure sign that faith is true and living. "All this takes place not in separate and successive moments of time, but *uno actu temporis*. Faith and Justification are verily the cause and ground of love and sanctification, the latter the effect and result of the former, taking place not in chronological succession, but in a succession of reality. Were it otherwise, if love were subsequently added to faith, then faith would not in and of it-



self be the living power of love; but it would be first made alive through the superadded love, and we should be carried back again from the idea of the Protestant *fides viva*, and brought into the idea of the Catholic *fides formata*.”\*

Again: “Faith justifies before God, in so far as the righteousness of Christ is imputed to it, which covers sin and takes away debt, not in so far as the righteousness of Christ is infused into the subject, and is stamped upon it as its own subjective holiness and righteousness. Faith justifies without asking whether sin has been rooted out of the heart and destroyed or not, but because it is covered, forgiven, not reckoned, not regarded from the side of God.”†

This, beyond question, is the Lutheran position. In the passage already quoted from the *Loci* Melancthon declares: “When God pardons sins, he at the same time gives the Holy Ghost, who begins new virtues. \* \* \* The new virtues follow reconciliation.”‡ And in his celebrated letter to Brentz, in 1531, he writes: “You imagine that men are justified by faith, because by faith we receive the Holy Ghost, and afterwards are justified by the fulfilling of the law, which is effected by the Holy Ghost. This supposition places righteousness in our work, in our purity or perfection, albeit such perfection ought to follow faith. But turn your eyes wholly from renovation and the law to the promise and to Christ, and know that we are justified on account of Christ, that is, that we are accepted before God, and find peace of conscience not on account of that renovation. Such renovation is not sufficient. We are justified by faith alone, not because it is the root, as you write, but because it lays hold on Christ, on account of whom we are accepted.”§

Again, in opposition to Osiander: “Our churches concede that we ought to be renewed, and that God is the cause of such renewal, and dwells in the saints. The indwelling is as

\* Philippi, *Symbolik*, p. 342.

† *Ibid.*, p. 338.

‡ C. R., 21 : 742.

§ C. R., 2 : 501.



follows: The Son gives the word of consolation. In this word is seen the will of the Father. At the same time he sends the Holy Ghost into hearts, who comforts the heart, and kindles love and devotion and all the virtues. But a person does not have reconciliation and remission on account of this renewing. But pardon and reconciliation, which are justification by faith for the sake of the Mediator, God and man, must be received first. When such faith beholds the Mediator we come to God and are justified, that is, accepted, not on account of our renewing; but righteousness is imputed to us on account of the Mediator.\*

Equally clear is Luther. In the *Preface to the Epistle to the Romans*, he says: "Faith is a divine work in us, which changes and regenerates us (John 1 : 13). It slays the old Adam, makes new creatures in heart, disposition and spiritual strength, and brings with it the Holy Ghost. Faith is a living, active, mighty thing. \* \* \* By faith the believer is weaned from sin, and conceives an affection for the divine law; by this he gives God the glory, and renders due honor to his name." "Faith brings with it a host of splendid and glorious virtues, and is never alone. Hence the one is not to be confounded with the other; and what is of faith alone, is not to be assigned to virtues and works. Faith is like a mother from whom springs and is born this growth of splendid virtues. Hence where faith is not first, you will seek in vain for the virtues themselves."† "These are the two parts of Justification. The first is the grace revealed through Christ, that through Christ we have a reconciled God, and that sin can no more accuse us, but conscience by faith in the mercy of God is brought to quiet. The second is the gift of the Spirit with his gifts, who illumines against the filth of the spirit and flesh, that we may be defended from the machinations of the devil."‡

"The two parts must exist together in a Christian, and be urged in Christian teaching: First *faith*, namely, that by the

\* C. R., 8 : 195.

† Walch, 1 : 1430.

‡ *Op. Ex.*, 19 : 49. See p. 109.

blood of Christ we are redeemed from sin and have forgiveness. Secondly, if we have this, *that we then are to become different persons and walk in a new life.* \* \* \* There are two things, the forgiveness of sins and the mortifying of the same, and both must be urged against those who confuse and pervert this order by false doctrine."\*

The same relation is exhibited in the Apology: "Because faith brings the Holy Ghost and begets a new life in hearts, it must follow that it produces spiritual emotions in the heart. Therefore after that we have been justified and renewed we begin to fear God, to love, to thank and to obey God"

We must be in Christ and be clothed upon by his righteousness before Christ can dwell in us and destroy the root of sin. Only in this way can Justification have its true significance and exert its power in Christian teaching and life.

Beginning with Calovius, the dogmaticians reversed this order, thrust Justification out of its central position, and postponed it to regeneration. A hard and dry orthodoxism now entered. Justification was looked upon rather as a doctrine to be believed, than as an experience of salvation to be enjoyed. In a word, Lutheranism had become very un-Lutheran; the active principle of its system had degenerated into a dogma. As a result Christian life declined, and the conscious fellowship with God in Christ was undervalued.

Luthardt has returned to the old order: Both in his *Dogmatik* and in his *Glaubenslehre*, he discusses *Faith*, and *Justification* before he takes up *Regeneration*. Rohnert has the order: *Faith, Justification, Vocation, Illumination, Regeneration and Conversion*. In treating the *Ordo Salutis*, he says, exactly in accord with the oldest teachers, and with the Confessions: "As we have seen, Justification by faith forms the real central act of divine grace by which the sinner becomes a child of God, and receives personal participation in the redemptive work of Christ. With Justification there takes place at the same time a moral change of the person by the power of the Holy

\* Erl. Ed., 8 : 264.

Ghos  
chan  
ing  
order  
post

2.

heart  
with  
servi  
eous  
the r  
must  
scien  
prese  
fies  
confi  
Chris  
ually  
that  
right  
merc  
of th  
confi  
cause  
the s  
quiet  
so un  
riage  
may  
long  
everla  
these  
death  
me, t  
flict

\* D

Ghost. This entrance into a state of grace, and the inner change of the justified connected therewith, take place according to a distinct order, called the order of salvation." That order places "Justification absolutely in the foreground, and postpones *vocare, convertere, regenerare et sanctificare*."\*

2. Since Justification gives fellowship with God and a new heart, two things must follow: (a) Where there is fellowship with God there must be peace of conscience and delight in the service of God. As the believer's righteousness is the righteousness of Christ, which is perfect, and which is in no sense the result of human merit, it follows that such righteousness must satisfy all sense of guilt, and every accusation of conscience. This result of Justification has been most beautifully presented by Melancthon in the Apology: "Faith alone pacifies the heart, which obtains rest and life when it freely and confidently relies on the promises of God for the sake of Christ. But our works can never pacify hearts; for we continually find that they are impure. Consequently it must follow, that through faith alone we become acceptable to God and are righteous when we are satisfied in our hearts that God will be merciful to us, not on account of our works and our fulfillment of the law, but by grace alone for Christ's sake." It is this confidence in the grace of God for the sake of Christ, or because of the obedience and righteousness of Christ, that gives the soul the sense of freedom from condemnation, and that quiets the conscience in the hour of temptation. Christ has so united himself with the believing soul in spiritual marriage, "that whatever Christ possesses, that the believing soul may take to itself, and boast of as its own, and whatever belongs to the soul that Christ claims as his." "For Christ is everlasting peace, consolation, righteousness, and life; and to these the terror of the law, heaviness of mind, sin, hell, and death, must needs give place. So Christ living and abiding in me, taketh away and swalloweth up all evils that vex and afflict me. This union or conjunction, then, is the cause that I

\* *Dogmatik d. Ev. Luth. Kirche*, pp. 341-5.

am delivered from the terror of the law and sin, am separate from myself, and translated unto Christ and his kingdom, which is a kingdom of grace, righteousness, peace, joy, life, salvation and eternal glory."\*

(*b*) As faith regenerates the heart and gives the Holy Ghost, the justified person must do works acceptable to God. The new power of love and obedience, the new principle of life within the soul, will strive against sin, and will bring forth the fruits of faith. They will also prompt to the keeping of the law, and to the service of needy and suffering humanity. Luther's famous paradox: "A Christian man is the most free lord of all and subject to none; a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, and is subject to every one," expresses the true Christian life-ideal. Faith frees the Christian from the bondage of the law, and from rites and ceremonies instituted by men; but it quickens the conscience, animates the sense of duty, and warms the heart with love to God and to man. As a living, acting, energizing principle reigning in the regenerate heart, it impels the Christian by an inner necessity of his new nature to do the will of God from the soul (Eph. 6 : 6). "O, what a living, busy, active, mighty thing is faith. Therefore it is impossible for it not to be constantly doing good. It does not inquire whether good works are to be done, but before the question is asked, it has done them, and is always doing them. The person who does not do good works is destitute of faith, gropes and looks about for faith and good works, and knows not what faith and good works are, though he prates a great deal about both."†

Christian good works consist in serving one's calling with faith in God, and with love to one's neighbor. Hence the Christian must stand in his place, wait on his calling, and do good to others as he has opportunity. "Faith is the actor, love is the act. Faith brings man to God, love brings him to man. By faith he becomes acceptable to God; by love he does good to men." Any work, therefore, that makes our fellowmen

\* *Commentary on Galat.*, Chap. II, v. 20.

† *Preface to Romans*, Erl. Ed., 63 : 125.

happier and better is a good work in the Christian sense, provided it proceed from faith.

But we must not carry this principle of faith so far as to maintain that the veracity, honesty, and beneficence of non-Christian people, "are only splendid vices." God is a Being of moral discernment, and must approve truth, virtue, and beneficence wherever found, though virtues and works can never make anyone righteous before God, or procure the pardon of sins. The judge is just, and he shall render unto every man according to his deeds (Matt. 16 : 27). We have only to maintain the twofold principle that no conformity to the letter of the law can make man righteous before God, and that out of faith will arise the keeping of the law according to its spirit. Hence Justification does not abrogate the law ; it gives power to obey the law out of love.\*

## V.

### THE RELATION OF JUSTIFICATION TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

I. Faith unites us with Christ, and makes us members of his body, so that as believers we and Christ live one life. "For me to live is Christ" (Phil. 1 : 21). Faith also brings the Holy Ghost into our hearts, who sanctifies and cleanses us from sin. And as all believers are united to Christ, their common Head, and have the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier of all, so they come to be united to each other, and to have a like generic holiness. Hence they constitute the company of believers, the *congregatio sanctorum*, the *societas fidei et Spiritus Sancti in cordibus*, who have "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all, and in all" (Eph. 4 : 5). This goodly company, thus united under the same headship, is the congregation of all believers scattered throughout the earth, whose essential quality is holiness. To this congregation belong only those who are first united to Christ and have the Holy Ghost dwelling in them. "Ye were washed, ye

\* See Erl. Ed. (Latin) 3 : 305.

were sanctified, ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 6 : 11). In other words, this congregation is a spiritual body. And as it is scattered throughout the earth, or exists wherever the Gospel is preached and the sacraments are administered, it is an object of faith : "I believe a holy Catholic Church." "And this Church alone is called in Scripture the Body of Christ ; because Christ is its head, and sanctifies and strengthens it through his Spirit ; as Paul says (Eph. 1 : 22-23) : 'And gave him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.' Therefore, they in whom Christ effects nothing through his Spirit, are not members of Christ."\* And yet this holy Catholic Church is not an impersonal institution, an idealistic conception. But it is composed of living persons to whom the attribute or predicate "holy" can be applied—a "living body," "living members," "a spiritual people," "the pillar of truth," "the household of God," "the bride of Christ"—the people who "believe that they are received into grace and that their sins are pardoned for the sake of Christ, who by his death makes satisfaction for our sins"—whom God "accounts *justos et sanctos*." Primarily this holiness is the imputed righteousness of Christ, but it is also the personal sanctity of love to God and to fellow Christians : "Thus Paul enjoins love in the Church, which cultivates harmony and which, as there is need, bears the imperfections of brethren, and overlooks trifling errors, in order that the Church may not be divided into schisms, factions and heresies."† In this Church is the "communion of saints." As all true believers have a common Heavenly Father, a common Lord, a common faith, so they all have *eo ipso* a common hope, a common joy, and a common right to the means of grace by which the Holy Ghost comforts hearts and sustains faith. Hence a seat in the Sanctuary and a seat at the Lord's Table should be open to everyone who professes "this faith," and has been baptized, for "through bap-

\* *Apology*, VII and VII.

† *Apology*, III.

tism we are first taken into the community of Christians."\* And as we can no more easily discern who has "faith and the Holy Ghost in the heart," than we can discern who is destitute of these internal qualities, except where the life is openly ungodly and impenitent, so is it the duty of "the congregation of all believers" to admit to her communion, and to "the feast of love," all who name the name of the Lord and depart from unrighteousness (2 Tim. 19). "For ye are all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise" (Gal. 3 : 26-29).

2. Our principle also requires us to affirm the unity of the Church. There are many churches in the sense of local organizations, or confraternities of believers, or aggregations of local organizations of believers into national or international groups of churches having different ceremonies and different views in regard to many doctrines; yet there is only one Church in the sense of "the body of Christ," and of "the pillar and ground of the truth."

To this "body" belong multitudes whose knowledge is limited and distorted; who build on the "pillar, wood, hay, stubble;" but they have a faith that as really appropriates Christ and brings the Holy Ghost, as does the faith of those who are the stewards of the mysteries of God; for the quality of faith is not determined by its magnitude. A weak, ignorant, and erring Christian "shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved; yet so as through fire" (1 Cor. 3 : 15). And "for the true unity of the Christian Church it is sufficient that the Gospel be preached therein according to its pure intent and meaning, and that the sacraments be administered in conformity with the Word of God" (Art. VII). But the Gospel is rightly preached where it is taught "that God, not on account of our merits,

\* *Larger Catechism*, IV, *ad initium*.



but on account of Christ, justifies those who believe that for Christ's sake they are received into grace" (Art. V); and the sacraments are rightly administered, when Baptism and the Lord's Supper are administered according to the institution of Christ.

These are the marks of the Christian community, and it must be conceded that only in rare instances have they been so darkened and perverted that they ceased entirely to be "instruments through which God moves hearts to believing."\* But wherever there are believing hearts, there are members of Christ the Head, who stand "on the chief cornerstone; in whom each several building, fitly bound together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord" (Eph. 2 : 21). Hence, looked at from the standpoint of Justification by faith, it is evident that there can be but one holy Catholic Church. Since the Church in its essential characteristics is composed of those alone who are "holy," and since there is only one way by which men can become "holy," it must follow that there cannot be two or more churches, since the principle of classification is identical and invariable. From this it follows that the attribute of unity cannot "be predicated (1) of any *particular* Church, but of the *universal* Church, as no particular Church can claim that it is the one Church. It is one thing *to be the one Church*, and a different thing *to be of the one Church*. The whole Church is one. Our Church is of the one. (2) Among the various causes of this unity and on account of which the Church is called one, is the *one true* formal cause, *namely, that aggregation by which many by agreement in faith according to the truth, and by harmony of will according to Christ, have a communion by means of which many members of the same body are one, because all connected with the head have and receive from the same head, the same life, the same feeling and affection; just as many children in the same family are one because by the bond of consanguinity and love they are united to their parents.* The one formal ground of this unity is *consent in regard*

\* *Apology*, VII and VIII.



to the teaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. (3) Though this consent must be confined especially to the chief fundamental articles, since in secondary matters consent is not always required, especially if there be no negation and no heretical and positive dissent."\*

But as this congregation of saints and true believers actualizes itself in "living members," in "a spiritual people," so it manifests itself openly in organizations, constitutions, assemblies, in the public preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. The essential Church thus creates the empirical Church, which shows the attribute of visibility. Men can see the Church, can locate it, can say, *Here is the Church*. This is the Church broadly so-called, and embraces all those who profess faith in Christ, and by Baptism have united themselves to the body of which Christ is the head. The one distinguishing attribute, "holiness," is applied synecdochically to all who profess to have united themselves with the one only Source of "holiness." In this empirical Church there are, doubtless, many hypocrites and false Christians. Those have communion with the saints in the external relations and blessings of the Church. They are in the Church, though not of the Church; yet they must be included in the Church as it appears on earth, which "is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind" (Matt. 13 : 47).

"Now although the wicked, and ungodly hypocrites, have fellowship with the true Church in external signs, in name and office, yet, when we would strictly define what the Church is, we must speak of the Church called the body of Christ, and having communion not only in external signs, but also holding faith and the gifts of the Holy Ghost."† Faith and the gifts of the Holy Ghost are Justification according to its two sides.

\* Carpzov, *Isagoge*, p. 303.

† *Apology*, VII and VIII.

RESTITUTIO VATUM; OR, THE RETURN OF THE POETS  
TO OUR HIGHER SCHOOLS.

BY PROFESSOR W. H. WYNN, PH.D., D.D.

Twice the whole current of modern history has been changed by agencies distinctively literary in their kind. In literature, therefore, in spite of the empirical ideas that prevail concerning it, we have a moral force that is actually in the lead of social progress, whether we regard it so or not. By literature we mean that class of writings that appeal to the more sensitive and imaginative aptitudes of the human mind, with the view of kindling aspiration and emotional glow-getting at the poetry of the situation, whatever that may be, and putting it in the lead. The arts of persuasion are not appealed to; logic is altogether set aside. Men are to be swept onward to the battle of life, not by the elaborate system-building of parliamentarians and economists, but by the martial strains that are filling the air with enthusiasm, and the flutter of the dear old flag beckoning them to the front. If we must define an influence so subtle, we should say that literature is the essential poetry of human life, couched in impassioned symbol, and winged with words that sing.

Now in all great world-movements this influence is first in the order of time. For example, the Religious Reformation—or Revolution, as Guizot prefers to call it—of the sixteenth century, the parent of all other revolutions, civil and religious, of modern times, was itself the offspring of the Renaissance, and the Renaissance was but restored Greek literature startling the inert mind of Europe to a new birth. The Reformation was carried, not by the labored system-building of Melancthon or Calvin, but by Erasmus' Greek Testament and Luther's German Bible—Erasmus a most exquisite literary artist, and Luther a poet and prophet combined.

An illustration nearer our own time is in the French Revolution, the far-up fountains in which it originated, and the recon-dite agencies that brought it to a head. There was much pretentious logic abroad; much philosophy falsely so called

There was a crushing problem in finance to be solved—the utter bankruptcy of the leading state of Europe to be relieved. It was the age of economics, and there was a great show of science and civic wisdom as to how the incubus of feudalism was to be thrown off, and society be reorganized from its base up. Two classes of writers maneuvered on this field—the statesmen, the financiers, the economists, on the one hand; the idealists, the dreamers, the literary class, on the other.

In the end Rousseau prevailed—a poet in all except the contrivances of verse. His *Contrat Social* was, indeed, a dream, a story, a romance, and poor France, in its attempt to realize it, was bathed in blood. But in the end that dream did revolutionize the world. It lurks to-day in the folds of our American flag, flaunting a fair promise of free institutions to all the world. Rousseau was no economist, no logician, not even a statesman well versed in European politics, as Burke was, in England, or Montesquieu, his own countryman of almost contemporary fame. He was a dreamer, a prophet, a poet, as I have said, with the power of incantation through his mother tongue. It is the mission of such a man to catch intuitively the highest ideas of his time, to see their eternal bearings, and give them the inimitable charm of a style that holds its rythm in the mind when the book is shut up and laid away. Of Rousseau it has been said that he was “a poet, a romancer, who made theories, instead of making romances”—dreams, that is, that embodied the tremendous realities of the coming time. His power lay in his literary art. “He had the rare advantage,” says Mr. Davidson, “of being able to express his imaginings in literary form, and in a style which, for simplicity, clearness, effectiveness and almost every other excellence, looks almost in vain for an equal.”

Well, if it is the peculiar function of literature to work dynamically upon the forward impulses of men, and against their froward impulses, we can see what a moral force it is. It is not extravagant to say that the great poets, because they wield the *Thyrus* of the literary art at its highest, are evermore the leaders and teachers of the race—not coming up in the rear of progress, but always in the van. I speak of the great poets,

not the ephemeral, not the idle singers of a day. They form and reform. They mold the language, lifting it from crude *patois* into the supremest marvels of linguistic refinement and affluence, in getting over our mind-echoes, in free passage, from soul to soul. They determine the moral temper of the age; they quicken its religious ideas; they are at the heart of all those deep-sea heavings of humanity that come out in epochal stages in the advancing years—forerunners, prophets—and when the event is past, singing still to us in the evenings of our days, because their message is of a kind that cannot die.

The great English poets, for example, how they have held “as ’twere, the mirror up to nature, shown virtue her feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure.” Where these appear in English history, we see this remarkable people making strides toward their destined supremacy among the nations, in keeping with the high promise there was in the prophet-bards who sang at their feasts—Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson—onward the English people are marching, while these transcendent poets are beckoning the way.

Shakespeare, for example, where in the scale of moral value shall we reckon him? Conceive him obliterated—then where would the English people be? Mr. Carlyle has a summary way of settling that point. “Which would we English people sooner give up,” he asks, “our Indian empire or our Shakespeare?”—one of those shrewd questions of his, that carries its answer within itself. In that galaxy of the preeminent few of the greatest of moderns that adorns the walls of the Palace of Art, all are British but one—

“For there was Milton, like a seraph strong,  
Beside him Shakespeare, bland and mild,  
And there the world-worn Dante grasped his song,  
And somewhat grimly smiled—”

and we hasten to enroll in the same immortal company the lamented bard who penned those lines—incomparably the greatest English poet since Shakespeare’s time—

There Tennyson, the flower of Arthur's men  
With his own hand essays to take  
The brand *excalibur*, and hurl again,  
Back to the mystic Lake.

In the death of Tennyson the English-speaking people are inconsolably bereaved, the more so as the interval of weary waiting for a successor is painfully prolonged. It was fitting that this great poet of our own time should go down to his burial with his favorite copy of Shakespeare in his hand, the elder brother in the world of letters keeping company with the younger, in the endless journey of the future, wherein they shall walk side by side, and be the twain chief prophets of all the world, in the world of thought and song.

But the secret of poetic genius—what is that? We shall find it uniformly to lie in a certain incommunicable witchery over the mother tongue. Open anywhere your Shakespeare or your Tennyson—the occult resources of the creative imagination will be caught, in free play, over every minutest shade of expression, and every fold of imagery with which their thoughts are clothed. The charm of it who can describe! It authenticates itself to the eye by a strange music that slips in through that channel to the inner ear, and on which we would fain linger until the sun goes down, and the vision of our ecstasy has faded into the night. And now it is a practical question, in our day of pressing interest: If the poets have this high function of shaping the social and spiritual destiny of the peoples among whom they appear—if they are in very truth the teachers of the race, how shall they get a fitting recognition in our colleges and schools?

John Morley, the preeminent statesman of our day, has these words: "But, after all, the thing that matters most, both for happiness and duty, is that we should strive habitually to live with wise thoughts and right feelings. Literature helps, more than any other study, to this most blessed companionship." Mr. Morley is a scholar, but also a man of affairs, and cannot be suspected of dilettante estimates of the graver issues of human life. He has been a profound student of the poets, and by aid of them has maintained the "blessed companionship" of

which he speaks—companionship of high ideals clinging to him through the fiercest of political storms. Witness of his kind to the supreme value of literary studies cannot be overlooked.

But we are reminded that this is an age of rampant commercialism, and that the money god is supreme. It is no time for sentiment when a madman is at your door, and a bloody riot is raging in your streets. The poets are an intrusion when society itself is in a condition of elemental war. Rather, in times like these, the mood of Brutus, when a poet came plunging into his tent uninvited, to assuage the angry passions of the quarreling generals on their way to Philippi—the poet ejected, and Brutus, breathing heavily, asks:

"What should the wars do with these jiggling fools?" Was not Brutus a philosopher, and did he not rightly estimate that, in time of war, at least, the poets were but "jiggling fools?" And yet the event showed that the poet was the wise man of the three—he flung a buffet between the swords' points of Brutus and Cassius, and saved the patriotic army from dissolving away in untimely confusion and disgrace. A poet was intrusted with the last friendly office to the doomed powers that would prop up the collapsing structure of the Roman State. But not on battlefields—rather in those great institutions engendering peace, would we see the poets enthroned.

Our burning question is how to get the poets duly and permanently installed in our higher schools. For long centuries the Greek and Latin poets were there, and without doubt the poet's function, everywhere the same, was in a measure discharged. Our repertory in those days consisted of splendid fragments of Homer and the Greek dramatists, of Horace and Virgil among the Latins—in the main, however, of both literatures, "the inimitable story of ancient Troy." We shall never forget that. Assuredly the perfection of the poet's art was attained, if ever, in telling that tale, and well nigh all the loftiest ideals conceivable by the civilized man, burned in legible outline all over the enchanted page. None the less we are reminded, that the Greek civilization was not the civilization of our day. The English people, and their American scions, are a commercial people, with merchant navies on all seas, and

trading industries that belt the world. Among this people modern science was born, with its formulas of evolution, and the correlation and conservation of the physical forces—the most stupendous secular outburst ever known in the history of the world. This tree of science, like the mystic tree of the ancient *sagas*, has thrown out new branches every year, and promises a universal fruitage from its boughs. In our new enthusiasm we accepted it for all that it proposed, and in a little time, as an educational agency, it grew far beyond the limited space accorded it in the schools, and began to clamor for more room, and still more room on the curriculum, threatening sometimes to subordinate the whole space to itself. In any event the time occupied with the ancient classics must be curtailed, and where Homer and Virgil sat serenely on their heights, a physical laboratory must be set up, and electricity be accepted as the prophet of the newer time.

Thirty years ago this movement began. Inch by inch the laboratories made their way. The classics receded into the background, or were thrown under the blight of a philological craze, whereby it was thought these ill-favored studies might be admitted to march under the banner of science now so triumphantly afloat. The scientific specialists came forward to bend all pedagogy to their behest—making the mistake, however, that, being specialists, they must teach as specialists, as if specialists were to be the uniform product of their toil. It is a mistake which they have never learned to correct to this day. But what was specially fatal in this condition of things was, that as the Greek and Roman classics receded, the poets went with them; and for the voice of the *vates* to grow silent in learning's halls—what could this mean? Just then the happy thought intruded to have the great English poets occupy the empty space. Why not? They rival and outstrip the ancient poets in all particulars except, perhaps, the amazing flexibility and music of their tongue. In the range of their human interest, and in their mastery of the “recondite soul of song,” the English masterpieces are long leagues ahead. Milton and Tennyson are, all in all, more than a match for Homer and Theocritus, and Keats, standing on the shoulders



of these, could peer over the loftiest Parnassean peaks. As for Shakespeare, all the great Greek dramatists put into the scale together could not outweigh him. There would be great economy of time, therefore, they all began to say, and the result no less attained, to let the English classics fill in on the space—time, most certainly, that long drill, for example, in the structural technique of the alien language whose literature was to be approached.

There was a great overflow of enthusiasm when this spacious expedient first came into view. But soon an unforeseen difficulty blocked the way. The English classics were unmanageable because of the too great ease with which they yielded themselves to the student's command. The older classics had a way of keeping the minds of the student glued to the page, at work among idioms and synonyms, with the view to an adequate rendering, no doubt, but in the meantime the soul of the poet slipped in, here and there, silently and subconsciously to illuminate the text. Behind the stubborn problem in syntax, and the shy idiom flitting elusively over the page, there was the lurking muse thirsting in her imaginative splendors and fitful inspirations wherever she could. The struggle and time involved in translating, gave the soul of the poet its right of way into the student's mind.

Now the English classics would dispense with this struggle and save this time, and—the end to be attained—give the laboratories a wider area over which to stretch their tents. But, alas! the game became so easily a losing one. It is the special disability of the English classics that they are so easily won. The eye can run over them in superficial gleamings and profuse wordy talk concerning them when the book is closed, but nothing, absolutely nothing, has been gained. Poetry, Carlyle urges, should be studied as one would study fluxions, but this is clearly impossible under the prevailing methods in the schools—impossible, except as some expedient may be discovered for keeping the mind glued to the text. Time and struggle, long and sympathetic brooding are just as necessary here as in any other domain of study, and if the regime falls short in this particular, and there is no fund of voluntary en-



thusiasm on hand to take its place, all hope of culture from this source must be given up.

We are pained to note that, after long years of trial, there is a feeling abroad, that the English classics have not fulfilled their early promise to substitute the extruded literatures of Greece and Rome, and secure for the schools, as it was reasonable to hope, a deeper and sweeter culture than they. Disappointment has fallen on this noble endeavor all along the line. The poets are not in the schools. The classic poets have been dismissed, and the English poets will not answer to their call. Meantime in the absence of an effective regime for the study of the poets, and the manifest failure of the methods in vogue, there is a loud cry for some signal step in the advance—which step in advance can never be made, until a mass of rubbish obstructing the way to the professor's desk has been removed.

For example, the idea that poetry is a volatile product, evaporating with the pleasurable moment, must be given up. We must conceive more adequately the function of the poet than as the transient singer on the waysides of the world, drifting away care, and soothing the ennui of the indolent and the rich. Unless our poets are prophets, that is to say, teachers and leaders of the race, it were altogether idle to challenge for them a chief place in our schools. There is a wide-spread notion abroad, in this industrial age of ours, that the great poets have only a vacation value, a whiling-away leisurely function, like that of the minstrels at the ancient feasts. Happily one of their own number may be spokesman here—

"He saw through life and death, thro' good and ill,  
He saw thro' his own soul,  
The marvel of the everlasting will  
An open scroll  
Before him lay."

—rehearsing what he sees under the glow of an imaginative inspiration, that finds the imperishable phrase and underlying rhythm, suited to such conceptions, at the moment of their birth.

Confessedly poetic genius is the higher order of genius-in-

ventive, creative, bringing in from the unknown a new product, as much so as when the physicist from long groping discovers a new force—only the poet's mood is the more prolonged and strenuous, because dealing with things intangible to the sense. "Poets are all who love, who feel great truths, and tell them"—loving and feeling great truths, and then alert to catch the winged articulation in which they come—this is, as nearly as we can define it, the way in which the genius of the poet works. He is not singing for entertainment; though, as in all art, a feeling of rapt enjoyment is inseparable from the song he sings. But he has a musical message for susceptible ears—truths, the higher order of truths—ideals which fashion and govern the world. If he were singing for entertainment merely, he has competitors in the field that would soon drop him out of sight. "Push-pin were better than poetry," and infinitely better the national game of college ball. No; the poet is prophet, or the ages and sages have been strangely fostering an infatuation all these years.

Now, if we keep these two things in mind—first, that the poet is prophet, and, second, that, as in the case of all prophets, he gets his message from wisdom's inner shrine—we are well on the way to discover the manner, the peculiar attitude of mind, in which his message is to be received. Emerson, essentially a poet, and, but for an unaccountable bluntness in his sense of rhythm, a poet of the first class, discloses the secret of his rare inspiration in his correspondence with Sterling—drawing the veil shyly aside from his inner life. He writes of "the pristine sacredness of thought." "All thoughts are holy when they come floating up to us in magical newness from the hidden life"—going on to say, that we often desecrate them by tampering with them in those colder moments when the glow of absolute faith in them has been frittered away. "We must needs meddle ambitiously with them, and cannot quite trust that there is life, self-evolving and indestructible, but which cannot be hastened at the hint of every physical and metaphysical fad."

There is a rich psychological revelation in these words—"thoughts are holy when they come floating up to us in magical

newness from the hidden life"—and we do not tamper with them in the spirit of unbelief. The secret of all genius is here. The poet, the inventor, the orator in his more exalted moods, all become the somewhat passive subjects for this self-evolving indestructible life, pressing against the gates of utterance, and finding vent in a vocabulary of its own. In terms of the New Psychology, these great souls draw from the inexhaustible fountains of the "subliminal self"—a recess in the human personality where the eternities harbor, and out of which all great discoveries emerge.

But in particular Mr. Emerson urges that the process cannot be hastened. We must place emphasis on this. All poetic genius waits, and broods, and lingers, and returns when temporarily baffled, and hearkens as men were wont to listen for the pipings of the great Pan in the Arcadian woods. That which comes, authenticates itself in its own behalf; has come in its own time; and has the glow of instantaneous perfection on it, as it "floats up in magical newness from the hidden life." Wordsworth tells of the same great secret in these remarkable lines:

"Nor less I deem that there are powers,  
Which of themselves our minds impress;  
That we can find this mind of ours,  
In a wise passiveness."

And he himself, perhaps more than any other poet, is an example of the fine automatism of the deeper poetic breathing, as, also, of the profane handling, rebuked by Emerson, that fumbles the down on the butterfly's wings.

Now, it is not extravagant to say that the highest poetic genius of all the ages is the lineage of the English blood. Our distinction is that we have a heritage in the literary art, rich and profuse beyond any other in the world, in a vast and incomparable idiom that is our own, beckoning us from all shelves, and requiring no toil over the stony highways of translation to bring their treasures in. And yet our age seems to be oblivious to this fact. Milton, Shakespeare, Tennyson and the rest are suffered to gather dust in our libraries, because, it is said, our recreation pleasures are of another kind, and lend

themselves to our refreshment with less fatiguing mental strain. I think I discover the evil in the manifest delinquency of the great schools, whose business it is to fashion the public mind, in their impoverished idea of what poetry is. Poetry is not pastime, and it should not be studied as if it were. The schools, neither in theory nor practice, should give countenance to so debasing an estimate of one of the greatest moral forces known among men.

Our plea is that the poet as prophet shall be reinstated in our schools. Let Colin Clout come home again. He has been in exile because he has not been understood. In general outline this can be brought about, by getting the mind of the student into sympathetic privacy with the great poets, waiting on them, and walking with them, along the dim corridors and far-off reaches of song, whence their inspirations have sprung. Spirit with spirit—let that be the key. Let all the incentives and solicitations of classroom drill be exclusively literary—not historical, not philological, not rhetorical—but intent only in getting the mood of production repeated proximately in the mood of reproduction; or, what is the same thing, putting the student where the poet was when his message floated up to him from the hidden life—

"As when we dwell upon a word we know  
Repeating, till the word we know so well  
Becomes a wonder and we know not why—"

—in some such way as that are the treasures of the poets to be caught up and assimilated by susceptible minds.

But it is especially unfortunate that the dominance of scientific methods in our schools should have witnessed the absurd attempt to grind up literary studies in the same mill. There is no antagonism between poetry and science, but it is not best that either should be subject to the other's rule, since both are equal heirs to the same munificent estate. The mood of the scientist, rigidly analytical and matter-of-fact as it must be, is strongly alien to the integral glow of mind in which all the great masterpieces of the poetic art are born—indeed, when too exclusively indulged, will dry up every fountain of aesthetic

susceptibility as if swept by a simoon. As bearing on this point, let us hear Mr. Darwin's confession and regret. "Up to the age of thirty, or beyond it, poetry of many kinds, such as the works of Milton, Gray, Byron, Wordsworth, Coleridge and Shelley, gave me great pleasure, and even as a schoolboy I took intense delight in Shakespeare. \* \* \* But now for many years I cannot endure to read a line of poetry. I have tried lately to read Shakespeare, and found it so intolerably dull that it nauseated me." Poor Darwin! to suffer an infliction of Shakespeare in a manner so rough. But he is frank, at least, and goes on in very noble terms to deprecate his loss. "My mind seems to have become a kind of machine for grinding general laws out of large collections of facts, but why this should have caused the atrophy of that part of the brain alone on which the higher tastes depend, I cannot conceive. \* \* \* If I had to live my life again, I would have made a rule to read some poetry and listen to some music at least once every week; for perhaps the parts of my brain now atrophied would thus have been kept active through use. The loss of these tastes is a loss of happiness, and may possibly be injurious to the intellect, and more probably to the moral character by enfeebling the emotional part of our nature."

Mr. Darwin's self-scrutiny is thoroughly ingenuous and keen, and even painfully appreciative of the nature of his loss. But presumably he had no training in the English classics while at school, else he must have known how to retain the uplifting influence of poetry, when the throng of his scientific pursuits forbade that he should ever again tarry leisurely at his books. It was no mean service to be preoccupied with the earth-worms in their burrowings, or with the ingenuity of the sun-dew in entrapping its prey. He who would bring any great discovery to light, must be absorbed in the object of his pursuit, and any one so absorbed will soon have no time nor disposition to open again the great books that so fascinated him in his youth. It goes that way with us all. As a general rule the great books, that hung like luminaries on the sky of our early years, must go behind the dim cloud of prolonged and exacting preoccupation with the sterner things of this world—the demands

of science, the inexorable clamor for food and shelter, and the wherewithal to be clothed. We are all in with Mr. Darwin there. Our Shakespeare, our Milton, our Wordsworth, our Tennyson, our Bible, even, may rarely be opened in the supreme hurry of life, but the imperishable residue of the school-day drill remains, in the form of impressions that cannot be dismissed.

It is at school that these impressions are stored up for memory readings and wayside suggestions, in the busy and business-thronged years to come; and, besides this, on the very social atmosphere around us these great books are invisibly afloat. But what if these aesthetic impressions came not to the young mind when they were due? Mr. Darwin's experience, however, will teach us this: That it is the province of the school, not to dole out facts, dry, hard, dead, and embalmed in some generalization equally dead, but to leave impressions on the young mind that cannot be erased—impressions, rather than facts—impressions in and through which the facts become alive. What weighed ruinously on the mind of Darwin, was the *apotheosis* of fact, and in this great scientific era of ours the schools are blindly repeating the offense. For some wise purpose nature in her pedagogy has put the imagination in the lead, and imagination is the plastic substance of the soul on which impressions are made. Therefore it is that fancy, often, in these susceptible years of our life, has the better of fact—lifting the soul, as Mr. Darwin says, "to the divine and the eternal," when, as in his own case, the most stupendous facts in nature had a conscious tendency to pull it down. The scientific specialist, for example, is concerned only with his observations and experiments—must see to it that they are absolutely correct. Accuracy to the millionth millimeter of the thing his formulas would embrace, is the shining goal of all his research—beyond that, of course, what practical result may be looked for on the industries and economics of the world. As to impressions on the young mind committed to his charge, the very suggestion, too often, savors of empiricism to his trained intellect, as if he were to let things slip loosely from the machine which he turns. Beyond the facts

and their splendid utilities, there are no impressions that he is aware of, that should divert him from his task. A whole world of mind and experience becomes thus, for him, nothing but an utter and dreary blank, over which only indolent and dreamy people have the hardihood to dwell. And yet we must not hesitate to affirm it—school life has its legitimate function right there, in that province of the mind which the specialist refuses to see.

Let us illustrate. History powerfully stimulates young minds, especially the exploits of those towering characters that have risen from obscurity, and thrown themselves into the breach in times of great national peril, and by voice, or pen, or sword, met the emergency, and left the imprint of their incumbent personality on all subsequent time. Reading of these, there sweeps in upon the wonder-loving youth a personal influence, an impression of soul upon soul, utterly unlike anything possible from all the best regulated laboratories in the world. And yet history, as contrasted with poetry, has this special limitation, that it, too, is held fast in the embrace of facts. The historian must not purloin his facts. He must rummage libraries, consult old documents, verify dates, talk with the last surviving veteran who fought in those wars. He must invent nothing, and in grouping have no deliberate bias toward partisan effect. Now poetry is released from these fetters, and builds up its impression on an ideal world of its own. The liberty of art! we hear much of that. It is the personality of the artist working by inherent right toward personality of effect—man acting on man, and not, as in the laboratory, force impinging on force, and the delighted manipulator standing by and encoring the result.

Let us allude to Hamlet. That wonderful character is almost a wholesale creation of Shakespeare's brain. There was no such figure in history. History would have been incapable of producing such a figure, not because she has not the material out of which to make a Hamlet, but because she has not the magic to throw the material into shape. Shakespeare did this, and lo! we have, standing outside the pale of history, a per-



sonality more powerful, all in all, than any which history has produced—along lines, of course, in which purely human faculty would be expected to move. And so this character presents, once for all, the literary paradox, that the most influential man in all the world, was a man who never lived at all. If ever Aristotle's dictum, that poetry is a more serious and a more philosophical thing than history, has had a verifying witness, it is in this marvelous creation of Shakespeare's brain. Suppose now a school-drill in this play, so ordered that the young mind will get the Hamlet mystery proximately illuminated by experiences and insights of his own, following the Dane arm in arm, close-locked, through the swiftly evolving stages of his tragic career, the very heavens bursting around him with their awful solemnities, and their stern purpose that judgment shall have its due—it is absolutely impossible that the impression should ever be erased.

But here, again, we must insist that the method is everything if the impression is to be made. The methods of science, dominant and imperious, in our day, among educators of every shade of pedagogical standing and eclat, are at once and forever inapplicable to studies of this kind. And yet, we blush to say it, in some of our great universities we have the experiment, in grim earnest, installed, of subjecting our great masterpieces of the literary art to a *quasi*-laboratory drill—the proposition, as I must interpret it, to put Hamlet on the dissecting table, and in a species of literary clinics, cut him up alive. It is a case of judicial murder on a stupendous scale. The labored analyses of those learned commentators remind one of the audacious amateur in the physician's art, who would gladly kill his patient if in the process he might perfect his surgical skill. Poor Hamlet! Rather give him over to the mouthing elocutionists and strutting actors, to be blown about in declamatory whirlwinds and "booted by the buskins," so that he die not before his time, nor have the fatal draught administered by any other hand than his own.

No; No; Hamlet shall not be given to the whirlwinds, or be booted by the buskins on the ranting stage. We have to



note with pain that the most prevalent and irritating misconception of the function of literary studies in the schools, is the idea that they furnish material for elocutionary drill. The brilliant and tragic passages of the great masterpieces are to be sought out and declaimed—beyond that there was nothing else to be done. In an alarming number of our colleges, great and small, elocution is thought to be more than vitally related to literature, even, in some sense, the thing itself. It seems to be taken for granted that whatever attainments the student makes in this way, can be in evidence, only, as, by aid of grimace and gesture, he can toss the famous passages glibly on his tongue. Now this low view of the aim of literary studies is the more irritating because of its prevalence, and because of the stubbornness with which it adheres. It is, of course, altogether consistent with the widely current idea, that the poets of the world have their highest qualifications in their ability to entertain. Such service would be greatly enhanced by the charm of a cultured utterance, with the added effect of well trained gesture and pose.

But, as before shown, the mission of the poets could not be more grossly misconceived. The poets bring up their treasures from the hidden life, and the meditative silence of that realm is inseparable from them, and the blare of the elocutionary trumpet is an intrusion and a snare. There is, of course, a legitimate place for elocution in any amply equipped school, especially in these days when phonetics have almost been created anew, and voice-culture can have most valuable scientific aid from that source. But elocution has no right to an inch of ground on the literary domain. Indeed there is imminent peril to the whole aesthetic household if these usurpers are near. The poets demand quiet, and the simplest attitude of soul that any one may know. But elocution is always a noise, and sometimes a systematic noise, blown out and blatant on the empty wind. It and literature should not dwell on the same floor, and when it comes to an exhibition of product, they should be catalogued from pole to pole apart. It must be known that they have nothing in common—absolutely nothing

at all. To this end we feel tempted to advise that emotional reading and James Whitcomb Riley be abated by law.

But seriously, now, it is in accordance with the nature of things, that these two branches should be kept jealously apart. Poetry may, with great advantage, be read aloud, but the emotional reading of the elocutionist—mouthing and artificial as it is almost certain to be—must have a stage by itself if tolerated at all; it cannot be allowed anywhere near the shrine of the poets, as a means of making their message known. The rhythm of the poet—what is that? The elocutionist is in no mood to make the discovery, and if peradventure it should slip into his ear, he would never think of putting it on the stage. This thing of rhythm in poetry has received much and careful consideration in our day. It has been found to be a swaying to and fro of the inner billows of inspiration, so to speak, in somewhat evenly measured impulses, like the waves of the sea. It is the rhythm of the universe suggested in the beating of the heart, and the pulsing of the stars—"the swing of the Pleiades," let us say, and the poet's breathing articulates itself in subtle movements like that, up and down, in ebb and flow, through all the intricate modulation of surd and sonant in the syllabic mysteries of the mother tongue. The nearest the human voice can come to imitating it, is by the unpretentious chant.

In speaking of a matter so important, the testimony of eminent specialists must be called in. Professor Shairp, the distinguished Professor of poetry in the University of Oxford, has these words: "Not of lyrical poetry only, but of all high poetry, may it be said, that it is only then fitly uttered, when it is chanted, not read, and so it is with a chant that most poets have recited their own poetry." An authoritative voice nearer home is to the same purport. Professor Gummere, in his exhaustive work on the *Beginnings of Poetry*, after having traced the element of rhythm to its very fountain head, pauses in his discussion to say: "Poetry, for public entertainment, is mainly read in the free declamatory style. This, to be sure, is not the way in which Tennyson, a master in poetic forms, re-

cited his poems; it is not the way in which one reads, or ought to read, lyric poems generally, when even the most ruthless and resolute 'Herod' of elocution finds it impossible to slay all the measures of three syllables and under"—a shrewd warning to elocutionists to keep hands off, when so inviolable a matter as the rhythm of poetry is to be expressed by the human voice.

The mention of Tennyson's way of reading his poems, recalls a current story illustrating his extreme sensitivity on this point. A lady of trained elocutionary power, no doubt, was induced to exhibit her skill in the poet's presence, with a company of appreciative people gathered to hear the lady give adequate vocal expression to some of the finer passages in his poems that had charmed the ear of the world. She was working her way through her task, it can hardly be questioned, after the most approved style. But, somehow, the poet grew more and more restive, as the reading went on, fidgeting with impatience under the finished inflections and cadences of the fair elocutionist's voice, until, exasperated beyond bounds, he let his passion get the better of his manners, and snatched the book from the hands of the reader, and went on with the task himself in what they called a sing-song style of this own. It was not sing-song; it was the inviolable chant.

Such are some of the obstacles that keep the poets out of our higher schools—all springing from the prevailing idea, unworthy and low, of the function of poetry in the tutoring of the race. It was early seen that the English classics could be read and not studied, and that under this disability they must become a mere shadow in the curriculum, unless something could be done to clothe them with the scholastic dignity of their comrades in the race. Then came the unhappy expedient of putting them down to laboratory methods, and filing them in under the banner of science—a banner, at this time, at all events, marshalling everything under it folds—absolutely everything under the sun. This failing, elocution threw itself into the breach, and the last stage of decadence was reached, when these great prophets of good were towed off to the cave of the

winds. If that cave can be as Virgil describes it, a scene of internal roar and riot, the very sea itself deafened by the clamor, what a hopeless venture it must be, in the midst of such a turmoil, to dream of a high world of calm, where the leaves of God's great book are unruffled, and the eye takes in its contents from the untroubled depths of science, and the solitudes that are vocal with the paeans of peace. Well, then, are the banished prophets no more to return?

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE CHRIST OF THE KORAN.

By F. R. WAGNER, A.M., B.D.

Even a casual examination of the Alkoran of Mohammed is sufficient to demonstrate the fact that there is no idea in the Moslem faith which corresponds to that of the Christ of the New Testament scripture. Mohammedanism is purely unitarian in nature, and recognizes no division of the Godhead whatever. The faith most heartily accepts Moses, Abraham, Lot, Isaac and nearly all of the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament, and, with these, also John, the son of Zacharias, and Jesus, son of Mary, are included as prophets and apostles of considerable importance. Several times, indeed, does the Koran reiterate the statement that "we make no distinction between any of them." All, however, are considered subordinate to Mohammed, who is accepted as the great and special prophet of Allah. "God is one God; the eternal God; he begetteth not, neither is he begotten; and there is not any one like unto him." The oft-repeated prayer of the pious Mussulman: "La-ilaha-il-Allah, wa Mohammed er rasoul Allah" ("There is no god but God, and Mohammed is his prophet") is really the *Kalima* or creed of his religion, and the epitome of the faith of Islam, which, at present, has more than two hundred millions of subscribers.

The two propositions of this "Kalima" Gibbon calls "The

eternal lie and the eternal truth." We have only to consult competent authorities in order to realize to what an alarming extent this "eternal lie" is accepted and incorporated with the "eternal truth." While Mohammed made no claims to a Messiahship nor even to divine origin, yet he is to-day held practically as the indispensable mediator between God and men, and the only efficient intercessor on the day of judgment. Rev. S. M. Zuemer, F.R.S.S., says: "Mohammed is called 'Light of God,' 'Peace of the World,' 'Glory of Ages,' 'First of all Creatures,' and other names of yet greater import. His apotheosis was completed by tradition. In the Koran he is human; in tradition he becomes sinless and almost divine. No Moslem prays *to* Mohammed, but every Moslem prays *for* his aid in endless repetition daily. His name is never uttered or written without the addition of a prayer. *Ya Mohammed* is the open sesame to every door of difficulty, temporal or spiritual." In the eyes of a believer, Mohammed holds the keys of heaven and hell, and, in this and many other respects, Mohammed may be considered the Christ (the anointed) of the Koran, for the name, the place, the office and the glory of Christ have been thus usurped by the False Prophet of Islam.

#### ESTIMATION OF JESUS.

With so much for the consideration of Mohammed as the usurper of some of the offices and glory belonging to Christ, we proceed to an examination of the Koran for its estimation of Jesus Christ himself. In general, it may be well to observe that, aside from denying the divinity and messiahship of Jesus, the Koran pays him the highest honors possible, and ranks him among the most important of apostles and prophets, giving him in fact special attributes denied Mohammed himself, and conceding to him supernatural power to work miracles even from his childhood.

#### THE BIRTH OF JESUS.

As to the nativity of Jesus, the son of Mary, the Koran  
VOL. XXXIII. No. 1. 6

speaks with considerable stress, and introduces the account of Christ's birth with the story of Zacharias and the birth of John. In the whole narrative the flimsy screen of alteration fails to hide the plagiarism of the Prophet, and the glaring perversion of the gospel to suit the purposes of the Impostor is strikingly apparent. The highest motive actuating Zacharias to ask the Lord for issue seems to be that he feared his nephews, who would otherwise have been his heirs and successors; however, he prays that his son might be acceptable to God. The gospel narrative is then followed, although not in strict detail, until the mission of John is mentioned. Here we find no trace of John's lifework—no intimation of a "John the Baptist," nor that the life of John was in any way connected with the mission of Jesus. All we know of him is that Allah said unto John: "Receive the book of the law, with a resolution to study and observe it." It is also stated that "we\* bestowed on him wisdom when he was yet a child, and mercy from us and purity of life; and he was a devout person, and dutiful to his parents and was not proud or rebellious." After Allah bestows his special benediction upon John, there is a sudden transition to the story of Mary and her son, without the faintest echo of a "voice crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord."

In the treatment of the conception and birth of Christ we also find trace of the gospel account. It may be called a *semi-gospel account*, with gross perversions and even an occasional attempt to patch up some seeming discrepancy. Gabriel appears to Mary, in person, with the divine annunciation and the assurance that "we will perform it that we may ordain him for a sign unto men and a mercy from us, for it is a thing which is decreed." In place of the journey to Bethlehem and the cradle-manger, we have the shocking information that Mary "retired aside with him in her womb to a distant place, and the pains of childbirth came upon her near the trunk of a palm tree." Here she despairs of her life and wishes that she had been lost

\* Personal pronoun referring to God, used in plural.

in oblivion. God then provides a rivulet and directs her to eat of the dates of the palm tree, and admonishes her to "calm her mind." Here let the Koran finish the story in its own language. "So she brought the child to her people, carrying him in her arms. And they said unto her, 'O, Mary, how hast thou done a strange thing; O, sister of Aaron, thy father was not a bad man, neither was thy mother a harlot.' But she made signs to the child to answer them, and they said how shall we speak to him who is an infant in the cradle?" Thereupon the infant Jesus spoke concerning his mission with all the depth and wisdom of a sage, after which the Koran continues: "This was Jesus, the son of Mary, the Word of Truth, concerning whom they doubt," and adds, as though fatal to the sonship of Christ, "it is not meet for God that he should have any son; God forbid."

#### THE CHARACTER AND MISSION OF JESUS.

Concerning the character and mission of Jesus, the Koran may be said to be very direct and unmistakable, yet rather brief, in its treatment. While it exalts his character as the most godly of men and zealously claims for him the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, it repudiates the least intimation in favor of his divinity. As proof that Jesus and Mary were human the Koran states emphatically that "both ate food," and it denounces those as infidels who claim Christ divine, because "they have attributed unto Him [Allah] servants as offspring."

The religion of Mohammed claims to be the same advocated by Jesus son of Mary, and which men rejected at his hand. In speaking to "the faithful" the Koran says: "He [Allah] hath ordained you the religion which He commanded Noah, and which we have revealed unto thee, O Mohammed, and which we commanded Abraham and Moses and Jesus: saying, 'observe this religion and be not divided therein.'" Christ is undoubtedly accepted in this sense and "proposed for an example" in the faith.

The character and mission of Jesus seem to be so inseparably



united that even the Koran recognizes this fact also, and considers both together. Let us notice one or two comprehensive quotations with respect to the same. Perhaps the most remarkable is found in the angels' message to Mary, in which we find concessions almost Christian: "O, Mary! verily God sendeth thee good tidings, that thou shalt bear the *Word*, proceeding from Himself; his name shall be Christ Jesus the son of Mary, honorable in this world and in the world to come, and one of those who approach near to the presence of God; and he shall speak unto men in the cradle and when he has grown up, and he shall be one of the righteous." From the cradle, the child Jesus testifies of himself: "Verily I am the servant of God; He hath given me the book of the gospel, and hath appointed me a prophet. And He hath made me blessed wheresoever I shall be; and hath commanded me to observe prayer and to give alms so long as I shall live; and He hath made me dutiful towards my mother, and hath not made me proud or unhappy." Here we have Christ "the *Word*," *proceeding from God*; we have at least two references to Christ as "strengthened with the Holy Spirit," and a number of allusions to his "evident miracles" as confirming his special office. Christ and the Virgin Mary are "ordained for a sign unto all creatures," and Jesus especially as "the sign of the approach of the last hour."

#### SPECIAL MISSION OF CHRIST.

The Koran holds that "unto every nation hath an apostle been sent," and it also claims, in view of this, that "God shall teach him (Jesus) the scripture and wisdom and the law and the gospel, and shall appoint him his *apostle to the children of Israel*." Here we have the special mission of Christ. He was sent to his special or particular people with "a sign from the Lord." This sign was the power to perform miracles, which power Mohammed even disclaimed for himself. The miracle of *the table* was especially used as a "sign from heaven" by Christ, in order to satisfy the incredulity of the people, and especially that of his apostles. On this occasion, at the sugges-

tion of his apostles, Jesus said: "O, God, our Lord, cause a table to descend unto us from heaven, that the day of its descent may become a festival day unto us, unto the first of us and unto the last of us, and a sign from thee; and do thou provide food for us, for thou art the best provider." The response was: "Verily I will cause it to descend unto you, but whoever among you shall disbelieve hereafter, I will surely punish him with a punishment wherewith I will not punish any other creature." As a disclaimer of any divine power in Christ himself, we are expressly informed that Jesus wrought his miracles "by the permission of God." Thus we are told that he created a bird "from clay, 'healed the blind' and the leper, and even raised the dead—by the permission of God."

According to Mohammed's account, Christ was commissioned to "confirm the law, which was revealed before him," and even to allow unto Israel, *as lawful*, "part of that which hath been forbidden"—whatever that may imply. He was to prophesy even what his people should eat and what they might lay up in store in their houses.

#### REJECTION OF JESUS.

The rejection of Christ is admitted by the Koran, and "when Jesus perceived their unbelief, he said: 'Who will be my helpers towards God?'" This was the calling of his apostles. The record implies that there were those who answered: "we will be the helpers of God." The apostles, in prayer to God, confess: "O, Lord, we believe in that which thou hast sent down, and we have followed thy apostle;" and then they express a desire to be written down with those who bear witness of him."

There is one incident in the Koran in which the apostles of Jesus are also considered as divinely commissioned to present the gospel. The occurrence is especially "propounded as an example" to be used in preaching the doctrines of Islam to show the consequences of rejecting God's messengers. The apostles of Jesus here receiveth the unrestricted endorsement

of the Prophet. The account is, in brief, as follows: Two apostles were sent to Antioch. Their duty was "only public preaching," for which they "desired no reward." They were charged with imposture by the people. Another apostle joins the rest at this juncture, and together they make a public claim to be sent by God to preach. They are then commanded to desist upon pain of being stoned. A special messenger came—"a certain man came hastily from the further parts of the city"—and entreated the people to accept the apostles and their message; but the people stoned this special messenger to death. In consequence of this wickedness, at "one cry of Gabriel from heaven they became utterly extinct." By thus recognizing the mission of these apostles, the Koran may be said to accord additional credit and sanction to Christ and his followers.

We find, therefore, that the Koran refers to the rejection and persecution of Christ and his apostles as among the greatest sins of mankind. "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." This sin is regarded as meriting the wrath of God; and on account of this outrageous conduct, God will send no more apostles to men, for "no apostle cometh unto them, but they laugh him to scorn." "God hath sealed them *up* because of their unbelief," and it is even stated that the unbelievers "were *cursed* by David and by Jesus, son of Mary." Strange to say, on the other hand, we also find this positive statement in the Koran: "And there shall not be one of those who have received the scriptures, who shall not believe in him (Christ) before his death." While this refers to a belief in his apostleship only, so far as the Koran is concerned, yet, from a Christian standpoint, it sounds almost like an inspired prophecy in favor of Christianity, and not very unlike Isa. 45 : 23, and Phil. 2 : 10, 11.

#### THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS, AND HIS RESURRECTION.

The Koran denies that the Jews succeeded in crucifying Jesus; although it concedes the fact that the crucifixion really occurred. It claims that Christ was "represented by one in

his likeness," and that this substitute was crucified, and was believed by the Jews to have been Christ himself. "They did not really kill him; but God took him up unto himself; and God is mighty and wise."

Under these circumstances there is no resurrection of Christ admissible, although the Mohammedans are very firm advocates of the general resurrection on the "last day." With them, Christ has not "become the first fruits of them who slept." Their belief in the resurrection is based entirely upon general principles or "signs"—notably that of the fruition of the "dead earth," quickened by rain and sun to "produce there-out various sorts of grain," trees, vines, etc., and "to cause springs to gush forth."

#### JESUS CHRIST AND THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

The description of the Day of Judgment has a number of minor things in common with the New Testament account. There are, however, some very considerable differences in the aggregate. "The trumpet shall be sounded and whoever are in heaven and whoever are on earth shall expire; except those whom God shall please to exempt from the common fate. Afterwards it shall be sounded again; and behold, they shall arise and look up; and the earth shall shine by the light of the Lord; and the book shall be laid open, and the prophets and the martyrs shall be brought as witnesses, and judgment shall be given between them with truth, and they shall not be treated unjustly." Christ, who is "the sign of the approach of the last hour," shall then appear also as witness at the resurrection and shall testify against the unbelievers. He shall also, at this last day, deny that he ever claimed divinity. "This is the day of judgment; this is the day of distinction between the righteous and the wicked." "How happy shall the companions of the right hand be!" "How miserable shall the companions of the left hand be!"

## SUMMARY.

Thus, amidst the mad ravings of the False Prophet of Allah, we are able to discern but a few distorted and incoherent facts concerning the true Redeemer of men. His divinity and life-work are buried hopelessly beneath the debris of this base and radical unitarianism, and the pure and unselfish precepts of Jesus of Nazareth are supplanted by the sensuous and ambitious pretensions of an unprincipled impostor, who so skillfully and successfully preyed upon the impetuous and bewildered mind of the Orient that he was enabled to establish this "eternal lie" in the guise of "revelations" direct from heaven. "In the name of the most merciful God," the arch Pretender of Mecca arrogated unto himself the authority to produce the greatest and most glaring forgery this world has ever seen.

To summarize in a word, the Koran states: "Jesus is no other than a servant, who succeeded Noah and Abraham, *favoured* with the gift of prophecy, appointed an example to the children of Israel and a sign of the approach of the last hour." He was given the gospel, and power, or permission, to work miracles, and Allah "put into the hearts of those who follow him mercy and peace."

## ARTICLE IV.

## BEAUTY IN RELATION TO RELIGION.

BY PROFESSOR L. A. FOX, D.D.

In the first quarter of the last century Victor Cousin wrote a book with the title of *True, Beautiful and Good*. It was a discussion of the principles of his philosophy which he gathered up into one statement—the finite, the infinite and the relation between the two. The book is not now generally known outside of philosophic circles, but its former popularity has left its name as a commonplace. Cousin was not the first to link the three words together. It was done by the Greeks as soon as their speculations emerged from the materialistic form of the earliest schools. Profounder thought has in every age seen that there is a relation between them, though it may have often failed to discover the nature of that relation. Kant, grim devotee of duty, and skeptic in speculative philosophy, regarded beauty as the synthesis of the true and the good, the bond between speculative truth and moral law.

At first view the three seem very widely separated. The true belongs to the sphere of the intellect, the good to that of the will, the beautiful to that of the feelings. Truth is the reality of things. Good is the voluntary adjustment of personality to relations. Beauty reveals itself in sentiments. Truth is what is to be known or believed. Good is what is to be done. Beauty is what is to be admired. Truth is apprehended by the reason, good by the conscience, and beauty by the taste. Philosophy, in investigating the true, is theoretical and speculative, in inquiring after the good is practical and moral, in treating of the beautiful is sentimental. Aesthetics seems to most persons abstruse, dreamy, useless. But despite the great difference, the fact that they are so often linked together both in philosophy and popular thought indicates that they are closely related in their ultimate ground.

What is beauty? It is easy enough to point to various objects in nature, in art, and in literature, and say there is beauty; but to define the quality we call their beauty has been found very difficult. It is one of the most obscure problems of metaphysics. That feature common to a rippling brook, a brilliant rose, a magnificent piece of art and a charming little poem, bringing all alike under the class of the beautiful, has had many explanations, but no one has given general satisfaction. But it is equally difficult to define truth, good, being, identity, time, space, unity and other things. All of them are primary facts of consciousness, pure intuitions, ultimate principles, and are indefinable. Beauty, truth and good are all eternal. They are objective realities, yet they are not independent entities. They are qualities, not substances. They are not mere mental abstractions but qualities of real being. They are the eternal attributes of the one Eternal Being. Plato saw this sublime truth and announced that, as God is the ground of all reality, he must be the primal source and center of all truth, right and beauty. God is infinitely true and holy, and he must also be infinitely beautiful. Right is truth revealing itself in character, and beauty is truth appealing to the sentiments by manifesting itself in form. God is infinitely holy because he is infinite truth, and he is infinitely beautiful because he is both true and holy. In knowing truth, right and beauty we know God. In becoming wise and good and beautiful we become like God; in some sense and in some degree we are identified with God. The true, the good and the beautiful in their ultimate essence are one. They are only different aspects, different manifestations, different relations of the same thing. Through beauty as well as through truth and duty we reach the divine. There is therefore a spiritual power in beauty.

The question then comes back with new interest and importance, what is beauty? Plato answered: "It is the spiritual shining through the sensible." Jouffroy expounded the same ideas in a different form. "It is the invisible manifesting itself through the visible." Hickok said that "it is sentiment expressed in form." Dewey, starting with the idea that even

perce  
ideals  
impos  
beaut  
capab  
of tas  
exper  
we se  
What  
ful.  
us to  
excell  
lower  
tured  
grees  
opmer  
The  
ness o  
ror of  
But  
ment.  
Conse  
first o  
action  
the in  
same  
judgm  
then l  
consci  
essenti  
beauti  
the se  
In it  
have n  
be a p  
fore th  
ens ser



perception is idealizing, held that it is the harmony between ideals and their forms. Each of these definitions contains an important side of the truth, but is incomplete. There is no beauty without form embodying an ideal, but the ideal must be capable of producing a peculiar kind of feeling. We have ideals of taste and when we find them expressed in sensible form we experience a feeling of pleasure different from that felt when we see that a proposition is true or that an action is right. Whatever awakens that peculiar feeling we pronounce beautiful. As forms more or less embody our ideals they appear to us to be more or less beautiful. There are different degrees in excellence among ideals, and there are therefore higher and lower forms of beauty. The child, the savage and the uncultured have low ideals and they are insensible to the higher degrees of beauty. Education in aesthetics is largely the development of higher ideals.

The sentiment is the most prominent factor in the consciousness of beauty, and many philosophers have fallen into the error of regarding the beautiful as merely subjective.

But beauty is a quality of objects which produces the sentiment. The aesthetic and the ethical faculties are analogous. Conscience is not simply a pleasant or painful feeling, but is first of all an apprehension of law, then a judgment upon an action, and then a feeling following the judgment. Without the intellectual acts the moral sentiment is impossible. The same thing is true of taste. There must be ideals, then a judgment upon the conformity of objects with the ideal, and then last of all the sentiment of beauty. Those who reduce conscience and taste to mere feelings rob them of their most essential element. The moral is a quality of actions, and the beautiful is a quality of form apprehended by the reason, and the sentiment is the will. The sentiment is rational feeling. In it reason becomes conscious of itself. Irrational beings have no conception of the moral or the beautiful. There must be a prior rational intuition, or an intuition of pure reason before there is the possibility of rational feeling. Beauty awakens sentiment, and we may by a subsequent act of judgment

determine the character and degree of the beautiful by the nature of the feeling; but the beauty must be seen by the reason before there is any feeling.

That embodied ideal, that something spiritual shining through the visible form, that peculiar power enwrapped with the sensible, awakening the sentiment of beauty, is one side of truth. There is no beauty without truth, and there is some beauty in every truth. Keats said: "Truth is beauty, and beauty is truth." The sentiment of truth and the sentiment of beauty are distinguishable not only in thought but also in experience, but they are only different effects from the two sides of the same object. An instrument may be both beautiful and useful, but we distinguish between the pleasure which comes from the contemplation of its beauty and that which comes from the study of its utility. The same thing is true of truth. Sometimes the pleasure is greater which comes from the side we call truth and sometimes from that we call beauty, but there is nothing beautiful that is not true and nothing true that is not beautiful. Fiction is beautiful only as it depicts reality. Antigone and Narcissa, Penelope and Portia are fictitious persons, but the characters are real, and in that reality lies their beauty. There is a seeming objection to beauty in music, for music seems to have little or no relation to truth. As we listen to the symphonies of the great masters we are not conscious of any thought; we are absorbed in the delightful feelings. But sound is the natural expression of feeling, and music seeks to awaken in us, sometimes by imitation and sometimes by higher art, the same emotions that are produced by real objects of beauty. We may not be conscious of a memory of the objects because of the exceedingly rapid association, but in them the sentiment had its original source. The beauty of music is derived. Without truth music is merely a concord of sweet sounds, pleasant to the sense, but it cannot be called truly beautiful. All beauty, therefore, is a side of truth. For this reason poets are often seers. Their aim is art, not truth, but they frequently anticipate philosophy. In the inspiration of genius they get visions of the true in advance of the cooler

scientist and calmer philosopher. Shakespeare and Aeschylus were artists seeking artistic effects, but there are no more faithful portraitures of human life and character than their dramas.

In this relation of beauty to truth we see one reason for its spiritual power. Truth, not beauty, saves and sanctifies. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "Sanctify them by thy truth; thy word is truth." Art refines, but only truth spiritualizes. Beauty in itself has no power to raise the natural life to the realm of the spiritual, but it may serve as an ally to the truth. It may open the heart to the saving truth, prepare the way for it, and thus make it more effective. It awakens the feelings, arrests the attention and furnishes an opportunity to the Divine Word. The beauty in our Lord's parables constitutes no small element of their wonderful power in the world. The beauty in the simple stories of the Bible accentuates the lessons they teach, and has helped them to hold their place in education. Truth adorned by the gentle touches of fancy attracts. Cold logic, if it gets a hearing, convinces but does not move. Calhoun was masterful in argument, but Webster, greater in the power of beautiful expression, carried with him the nation. The beauty in popular songs is not of a high order, but it is adapted to the masses, and it stirs and sways them. Fletcher said: "Let me write the songs of the nation and I care not who writes its laws." The Messænic war in ancient Greece was dragging heavily along until Tyrtæus began to write his martial hymns. Luther's hymns supplemented his sermons in the work of the Reformation, and Hans Sachs, rude as was the beauty of his verses, was a powerful preacher.

The analogy between taste and conscience indicates that there is a relation between aesthetics and ethics. The relation of both the beautiful and the good to truth shows that they must be related to each other. But they seem at first view to be widely separated, and it has been satirically asked,

"Is there any moral shut  
Within the bosom of a rose?"

We are reminded of the fact that the Greeks, the great teachers of the world in the fine arts, the idolaters of beauty, were degenerate in morals. The more splendid the art the more corrupt was the public character. Phidias, the greatest of all sculptors, the architect of the Parthenon and creator of the Jupiter at Olympia, two of the wonders of the world, was exiled for embezzlement. Goethe, the great philosophic poet of Germany, a worshipper of beauty, was vile in some of the features of his private life. Byron and Rousseau, upon their own confessions, were base men. Great poets, artists and musicians so often trample under foot not only conventional rules, but also the plainest moral principles that some believe it is almost universal.<sup>2</sup> The people think that every great genius is partially demented. But all this shows only that the good and the beautiful are not identical. It does not prove that they are not closely related.

There are a great many facts which prove a close relationship between them. The Greeks often spoke of them as the same and used *καλον* and *αγαθον* interchangeably. Even the stern, apathetic Stoic held that the morally excellent is the beautiful. The Psalmist speaks of "the beauty of holiness." We often talk about the beauty of character. Paul's heroic devotion seems to us to be in the highest degree beautiful. The world has not yet ceased admiring the grandeur in the heroism of Luther at Worms. Now can we describe the simple, earnest, consistent life of a saintly woman except by calling it beautiful? We cannot name the moral truth in a blushing rose, a murmuring brook, or a graceful vine, the very adjectives used to describe them show that somehow they are linked in our feelings with moral ideals. The white rose harmonizes with sweetness and innocence of life. Colors are made traits of character. In a great many ways men show that they habitually associate the beautiful and the good.

Both beauty and good have ideals. The good implies obligations and demands action. It seeks the attainment of an ideal. Beauty awakens sentiments and finds its end in enjoyment. The one seeks and the other reposes in an ideal. Ev-

every high ideal of virtue has its charm of beauty, and every beautiful ideal must be sought by the commands of the law. Moral obligation demands the realization of the beautiful. Beautiful ideals are a criticism of life, and put the mean and low under a law. The beautiful or the good may either be cultivated to the neglect of the other, but under the penalty of its own weakness. The two are distinct, like memory and imagination, like intellect and feeling, but they are not independent of each other.

Beauty has a refining power. Refinement is beauty brought into life. And refinement is a species of morality. Courtesy is a moral virtue. "Be courteous" is put by Peter along with the injunction to "have compassion one towards another," and to be pitiful. Impoliteness is a sin. The brusque, gruff, surly man is ugly in his disposition and manner, and to some degree must be regarded as immoral because he violates the law of love. The cultivation of the beautiful rests upon the life. The conquered Greek is inferior in the manly virtues of strength and courage to the Roman, but he is more refined and more attractive. Corinth with all her looseness in domestic relations is higher in the sphere of virtue than hard, stony Rome, whose relentless hate ploughed up the foundations of Carthage, her fallen rival. Paulus, demanding a pledge of the captain of the ship to reproduce the great masterpieces of art committed to his care if they were lost on their way, seems a barbarian in comparison with his cultivated slave. Greece conquered by arms became victor by her arts, and Rome is enriched, refined and ennobled by her province. Artistic culture is an essential part of general culture, and Matthew Arnold's definition is so generally approved that it has become a commonplace: "Culture is sweetness and light." The love of the beautiful sweetens the disposition, softens and refines the manner, and lends dignity to life. The cottage may be humble and poorly furnished, but the little flower garden in the yard, the vine trailing over the door, the bright tin glittering in the sunlight, the tasteful arrangement of the ornaments upon the mantel, reveal the true nobility of the spirit that presides within. In a refined life

there may be inconsistencies as in every other kind of character. In spite of the refinement there may be some bad tendencies that may sometimes get the better of us, and we may do things very unworthy of us. Is it not true also of the Christian? But that is not the real life. Rousseau was on certain occasions a liar, a rogue and an ingrate, but he did not live in that low atmosphere. He had beautiful conceptions, awakening higher aspirations, that made him ashamed of his meanness and extorted from him his confessions. If he had not lived in sympathy with the highest and purest possibilities of life and character he would not have been able to write that splendid tribute to our Lord, immortal alike for its beauty and truth. It was largely true also of Goethe. The general tone of his life was above those escapades of lust, and for this reason the German people condone his vices. Though beauty is not able to lift up the whole character and save from even the saddest falls, it does nevertheless elevate the general tone of life and impart a higher degree of purity. It makes us nobler and better.

Beauty is one of the means which our Creator has provided for our education. There is no satisfactory philosophy of life which does not regard the world as a place for discipline. There is no sufficient reason for our experiences here except as a preparation for a higher and wider sphere hereafter. Nothing in this life is complete. When one is best prepared to live wisely, he must die. Ours is by no means a perfect world as an end, but it is wonderfully fitted to be a means. We are at school. Our great Benefactor has established a university admirably adapted to the needs of our education. The equipment is complete without anything superfluous. He has filled the world with truths, but he has hidden them as problems, that while we are striving to solve them we may grow intellectually strong. He assists us just enough to enable us to help ourselves. He has surrounded us with dangers that we may learn to defend ourselves. He has given us intuitions of the great fundamental principles of ethics, but he has left us to develop them and explore the great field of moral truth. Temp-

tations come that we may become morally strong. He has also filled the world with beauty. There is sublimity in the vast prairie, in the illimitable ocean, and in the starry heavens. There is grandeur in the storm, in the mountain, and in the great river. There is beauty in the flowers, in the songs of the birds and in the rivulets. As we stand amid the mellow light of a Summer evening upon some mountain and look down upon the valley with its little city sleeping upon its bosom, its river winding its silvery thread through its groves and meadows, its grassy hills teeming with drowsy cattle, we feel that earth is an Eden. The scene is so peaceful and beautiful that it answers to the Grecian dream of Elysian fields. But after all the world has no perfect beauty. The infinite ocean has been compassed, and this great earth is no very big world. The starry heavens filled Kant with a feeling of awe but some of the best known of the planets appear to be lifeless. The mountain enchants because of its distance. The greatest objects of beauty have their defects. The imagination has given nature many of its charms and created

"A light ne'er seen on land or sea  
The consecration and the poet's dream."

God did not make an absolutely perfect world, because he wants us to become perfect. If the world had been perfectly beautiful there would have been no place for any art except the merely imitative. There would have been no opportunity for creations, and genius must forever slumber. The creative faculty would have been paralyzed and we would be deformed. But there is beauty enough to educate us. It invites, suggests, stimulates and inspires. Our Creator has revealed his plans for us and set before us his standard of perfection. He wants us to be intelligent. He wants us to be cultivated and refined. He wants us to be pure and good in moral character. But he wants something higher than these, high and noble as they are. He wants these elements in their greatest possible perfection to be exalted, assimilated and perfected by genuine spirituality. Spiritual life lifts the natural into its true end. From the stand-



point of the divine purpose in us the true, the beautiful and the good have only a relative worth. They are means for becoming divine. Made for God as we have been, things are good only as they bring us into the image of God. Truth, beauty and virtue are only means; they are not ends. If beauty had not had more than a mere power of refinement, if it had not possessed a spiritual power, God would not have made such extensive preparation for our education through it. Like truth and virtue it has an essential place in religion.

But the beautiful may be cultivated at the expense of the moral and the spiritual. Some artists revel in their ideals and neglect and despise the actual. They distort the real world and condemn the claims upon them of morality and religion. But they serve as a warning to those who want a true conception of life and its aims. Deformity serves as a foil to beauty, making the creations of genius seem the more beautiful; so the errors and sins and wrecks of onesided artists point out more clearly the true use of beauty. "Art for its own sake" is often heard from the devotees of the beautiful. "Art is an end." "Beauty needs no excuse for being." It is granted just as science and philosophy and pure mathematics and theology are ends. Art is to be cultivated without a view to gain or fame. It has its own place in the world, as science or philosophy have their places, and needs no apology for its existence. But all of them are alike means to the highest end, and only as they help to build up the purest character are they in harmony with the grand scheme of the universe. Art for its own sake is right in reference to other realms of human culture, but wrong in reference to the kingdom of God.

Beauty as the supreme end is an abuse. The study of abuses makes more manifest the proper use, and the abuse of beauty may be seen best in analogy. Civilization is a good, but onesided as ours is rapidly becoming, it may be turned into an evil. Earnest men are gravely discussing the question whether it will not prove ere long a curse. It needs to be permeated by the spirit of Christianity to save it from becoming a tyrant. Wealth as a means is good, but as the supreme end it is a curse. Religion

needs wealth as an instrument, but when a church warmly courts the rich and is proud of the millionaires among its members, it is in great danger of becoming earthly, a worldly association. Unconsecrated riches are a bane. Education is a good, but when it makes one dissatisfied with the only sphere open to him or disqualifies him for the only work he can find to do, it is an evil. It may be that we have magnified too much the value of our common school system, and carried it beyond the needs of society. But whatever difference of opinion there may be in regard to this matter there can be none among thoughtful men as to education divorced from morality and religion. Knowledge finds its highest and ultimate use in the service of religion. Science is good but as an end in itself it is, as Hæckel boasted, atheistic. Even theology, the divinest of the sciences, turned into an end is perverted. It has made men cold, narrow and bitter. Its aim is to make men Christlike, but what pages of literature are darker than some found in theological polemics? So beauty also has been abused. It has been cultivated to the neglect of the moral and the spiritual. It seems to be peculiarly exposed to abuse as the history of the fine arts abundantly proves. It appeals to the feelings, and when it is divorced from religion it leaves us a prey to the baser passions. Perverted it despiritualizes.

The danger of perversion and abuse comes more directly from the sensuous side of beauty. Beauty must have sensible form. On the rational side it is allied to the highest and best elements in us, but on the sensible side it is in close proximity to the lower feelings. Sentiment dependent upon sensation may be swallowed up by it. We see it in personal physical beauty. A woman's beauty may be a source of constant danger. The most chivalrous knight was dallying with temptations while he paid his devotions to his beautiful lady love. The luxury of sentiment may degenerate into the luxury of sense. The strong emotions accompanying the feeling of the beautiful may stimulate the craving for sensuous pleasure. The artist and the cook were in equal demand among the more degenerate Athenians. Amid the marvels of beauty in nature and

art men have been grossly sensual and turned themselves into elegant brutes surrounded by the splendors of a palace. What the power of beauty over us shall be is determined immediately by the stronger of the moral principles lying back in the foundation of our character. With high moral impulses and aspirations, beauty even in its lower forms is a means of rising to greater moral excellence. Spiritual life may through it elevate us into communion and fellowship with God. But without them the steps are downward and end in ruin.

This danger from the sensible is greatest in the lower degrees of beauty where the sensuous predominates. Socrates felt this danger and fought against it. Webster says that "he was so sensitive to physical beauty that he waged a constant war against matter." The beauty of color and figure may make us blind to the beauty of thought and character. The beauty of the music often makes us forget the beauty of worship. The beauty of the service may obscure or destroy the beauty of devotion. Peter was pointing out this danger from the lower beauty when he said: "Whose beauty let it not be that of outward ornament, of plaiting the hair and of wearing gold or putting on of apparel, but let it be the hidden man of the heart." He was not condemning neatness and taste in dress, nor the cultivation of physical beauty, but only the excess which sought the lower at the neglect of the higher. When the lower conceals or usurps the place of the higher, or when it fails to be a means of the higher it is abused.

Beauty may be a means of worship. With truth it is one of the attributes of God, and like truth it may bring us into communion with him. As there is no true worship without truth, so we may say that there is no worship without some degree of beauty. Certainly through the beautiful the heart may come into touch with God. The devout man, as he walks through the grove listening to the hymn of nature or stands upon the summit of a mountain gazing upon the grandeur of the ranges and peaks around him, may be worshipping his Creator. The Lord sometimes went into the mountain to pray. The fine arts may be helpful to devotion. "The great cathe-

drals are sermons in stone." The temple was as beautiful as the art and resources of the age could make it. "Beautiful for situation is Mt. Zion, the joy of the whole earth." One can worship in a log school house, but other things being equal one can come more easily into the spirit of worship in a church where all the appointments are beautiful and suggestive. The Puritans were wrong in making their meeting houses as cold and cheerless as possible and discarding all the beautiful liturgical forms in their service. Their character became as rigid and austere as their worship. The Roman Catholics understood our nature better, and they made their service beautiful and their churches grand. The Christian life has sustained Luther in retaining all that was beautiful without being idolatrous or erroneous in the churches and in the "liturgies. But while recognizing and availing ourselves of the helpfulness of beauty in worship, we must not forget that there is danger of abuse. In the rapid return to liturgical forms and in this age of costly churches we need a special warning. We are turning over the service of song to trained choirs and we are becoming satisfied merely with the beauty of the music. The service must be artistically rendered or we are offended, and a slip horrifies us. We are so pleased with the rhetorical finish of the sermon and the graceful delivery that we forget all about the lesson. We may be so impressed with the elegance of the pulpit and altar, with the harmony of colors, the splendor of the frescoing, the tasteful lines and angles of the edifice that we lose sight of the fact that it is the house of God. The handmaid in too many of our churches has become mistress, and Hagar has driven Sarah into the wilderness. The simplest rural church with its reverend worshippers, praying devoutly in rude forms and singing spiritual songs in jarring notes, may be more fruitful to the beauty of holiness, more in harmony with the nature of religion and more acceptable to God. In the highest sense the worship is more beautiful.

We will speak of only one more relation. Beauty and religion are both related to character. Beauty in nature is a revelation of God's character, and his character is the supreme

beauty. If we fail to find God in beauty we miss its greatest meaning. We cannot find God in his infinite richness and fullness while we ignore beauty; no more than while we neglect truth and right. There is then a religion in beauty. Beauty has its ultimate source in the divine character. Religion seeks to form a character beautiful like that of God. The truest beauty on earth is not in art or in nature, but in human life. There is beauty in "the human face divine," but greater beauty in a pure and noble character. The homely, almost repulsive, Socrates was more beautiful than the handsome, brilliant but degenerate Alcibiades. Mary, the neglected queen of Louis XV, suffering her wrongs in silence and selling her jewels to feed the poor, was incomparably more beautiful than the courted and powerful Madame Pompadour. Purity in thought, patience under trial, meekness under provocation, sympathy for the suffering, consecration to the good, prompt response to duty, are some of the elements of the highest beauty in this world. In an innocent and useful life there is order and proportion in all its expressions, a variety and unity in all its elements, a harmony and completeness in all its parts which make it answer to widely accepted definitions of beauty. In Christian character, the aim of religion, then is the purest spirit shining out through words and actions, and in it is the purest beauty. In our Lord's character we have beauty and religion in their greatest perfection. He was the embodiment of beauty because he was the perfection of religion. He is the "fairest among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely." Marked and marred by the signs of service the world was blind to his beauty, and it was foretold that for it he should have no form or comeliness and when it should see him he had no beauty that it should desire him. But his scars are his ornaments. The crown of thorns about his brow, the robe thrown around him to mock him, the nails that pierced his hands and feet are brighter jewels than the gems that rest upon a monarch's brow. The true, beautiful and good are perfectly blended in him. In his life religion and beauty are one.

Beauty and religion have their source and center in God,

their ground in truth, their seat in sentiment, their end in Christian character and their highest exemplification in our Lord. Either without the other is bereft of an important element, but beauty is the greater sufferer. Beauty and religion, these two, but the greater of these is religion.

---

## ARTICLE V.

### PROTESTANTISM AND CATHOLICISM.

BY DR. GERHARD UHLHORN.\*

It is a fact, plain before the eyes of everybody, that the conflict between our Church and Rome has become more pronounced again, and the never ceasing struggle has grown more violent. It is not our purpose to widen the chasm, or to continue the confessional warfare, from which our dear fatherland has suffered so much for centuries, and still suffers. However, we would like to call forth the cry of alarm: Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown. And it is our earnest desire to help to bring the present generation to a more living consciousness of the unspeakably precious truths that were given to us through the Reformation, that it might be reminded of its sacred duty to preserve these truths for succeeding generations.

An historical study furnishes the most suitable way to reach the standpoint from which we can judge the present conditions with greatest certainty. We shall attempt to give a survey of the history of the opposition and the struggle between Protestantism and Catholicism until the present day, in order to get a proper insight into the present conditions, which will guard us as much from false certainty as from baseless fear and anxiety. We shall also be helped to the impartiality, discretion and charitableness that come from understanding an age historically.

The Roman Catholic Church of to-day, as well as our own, springs from the period of the Reformation. Just as ours is the Church of the Reformation, Rome is the Church of the

\* Dr. Uhlhorn died December 15th, 1901.

Counter-Reformation. Thereby I distinguish it from the Church of the Middle Ages toward the good and the bad side. Even the Roman Church really experienced a reformation. Many abuses of the former age were abolished. The change was not only external; inwardly she received new life and power. But the reverse side is, that this reformation stands in opposition to the true Reformation from God's word. The Roman Church has become poorer, when compared with the Church of the Middle Ages, because she forcibly rejected those elements of evangelical life that the Church before the Reformation still possessed. Rome has also established herself in her error by stating as churchly doctrine and practice, and putting down as universally binding, that which in the Middle Age was the doctrine and practice only of individuals or of many, without its having been expressly recognized by the Church. Just as this whole transformation was effected under the influence of the Reformation and in opposition to it, so also on the whole has the history of the Roman Church since then been determined by this opposition. And from that time on her chief effort has been directed toward regaining that which was lost; her chief aim is the overcoming and the annihilation of Protestantism; her policy, her science, even her benevolent work must serve this end, and can be understood only on the basis of this opposition.

Spain is the native land of modern Catholicism. In it, especially under the influence and guidance of the great Cardinal Ximenes, a reform was attempted already before the appearance of Luther, which was as successful as any reform could be on the old foundations. Here churchly science was again fostered. Spain gave the Tridentine Council one of its firmest pillars, the Dominican Soto. Mysticism blossomed forth again, the Spaniard, Teresa di Jesu, by her mystic writings awakened again the inner feeling and the enthusiasm of the Middle Ages. From Spain came also a new activity in works of mercy. Johann von Gott, the founder of the Merciful Brethren, became the example for all later founders of similar orders, and his hospital became the model for the great work in the field of hospital nursing, which developed later. Finally from Spain came



also the order of the Jesuits, in which the opposition to Protestantism was embodied, which more than all other agencies helped to restore the papacy and to win back again that which had been lost, but which, for that very reason, gave modern Catholicism its strictest stamp.

This reformation, begun in Spain, was taken over into Italy, and there became the Counter-Reformation. In Italy, at the very heart of the Church, it was uncertain for a long time which way the further development would tend. The Popes were too deeply interested in the political affairs of the day to concern themselves earnestly with the interests of the Church. In the great struggle between the French and Spanish power, which filled the age, they stood sometimes on one side sometimes on the other, always seeking, as their chief end, the expansion of their own power. They were more anxious to secure advantages for their House, to provide their children and nephews with Italian principalities, than they were to reform the Church, especially since they had to fear a diminution of their power in every serious reform. More than once did the Pope prevent the Emperor from suppressing the Protestants, and secretly, in political matters, was in league against him with those whom he cursed as head of the Church. In God's wonderful counsel the Pope himself was made the instrument for protecting Protestantism, in its most critical times, from being overwhelmed by the power of the Emperor.

Thus, while the power of worldliness was still felt on the Chair of St. Peter and prevented any reform, the forces that urged reform were active in the circles of the laity and clergy, and reached the courts of princes and the college of the cardinals. Even in Italy there was a renewing of the religious sense. Men turned once more to the Scriptures and began to be more earnest in life. The clergy began once more to concern themselves for the people, to preach and to perform pastoral duties. New orders were formed to develop a better clergy and to prepare a reformation for the Church. Two tendencies were to be noted. Some approached the movement that had been begun in Germany. In a genuinely evangelical

way they went back to Holy Scripture, and preached justification by faith with the rejection of work-righteousness. Cardinal Contarini prepared a tract on the subject. In Naples Juan Valdez spread this doctrine, and one of his followers, a monk of San Severino, wrote a book on *The Benefit of Christ*, which was almost totally destroyed by the inquisition of that time, but has recently been found again. The Caputian General, Ochino, became a vigorous witness of grace. In opposition to these reformatory thoughts, the others held fast to the old, and saw salvation only in its revival. Accordingly the ways diverge by which the Church is to be reformed. Both parties want reform; the former seek it by reconciliation with Protestantism, and that in such a way that, without taking up its ideas unreservedly, certain things should be accepted, that is, a wisely mediating position between the old and the new should be sought, the latter want reform with the exclusion of evangelical elements and with the victory over Protestantism.

For a time it seemed as if the former tendency would win. Pope Paul III called to a commission for counsel concerning church reform, the head of this tendency, Cardinal Contarini, and, through his mediation, a number of like-minded cardinals. This commission formulated an opinion, in which the corruption of the Church was uncovered without reserve, and the absolute, arbitrary power of the Popes was designated as the source from which all corruption came. A number of propositions were made for limiting the power of the Popes and setting aside the abuses. The opinion was so sharp that later, when the conditions had changed, it was put into the list of the forbidden books. Then began the negotiations with the Protestants. In 1541 Contarini went to Regensburg to confer with Melancthon and Bucer. At this council everything seemed to go as desired. They began at once with the chief and fundamental article, the doctrine of justification, and in reality attained their end. Contarini recognized justification by faith alone and emphasized only that this faith must be living and active, which was never denied by the Lutherans. This is a remarkable moment in the history of the world. Still once more it seems as if the division shall be healed. How very

different would have been the course of the world's history if the union, which was then sought, which seemed to be so near, had really been effected! But the persons who joined hands in Regensburg were not those who could give the final decision. In Wittenberg as in Rome the union was mistrusted. Luther saw to it that it was not taken seriously and feared that on the other side they would not draw the consequence of the great concession. He saw in the whole thing only the tricks of Satan. During Contarini's absence the Pope was influenced by the opposite side; he even feared that a reconciliation of the contesting parties in Germany would increase the power of the Emperor. Contarini was called back. It almost makes one sorry to see how nearly agreement was effected, and that now the division was definitely settled. But it was God's plan that Protestantism should develop pure and unmixed with strange elements. Only thus could it unfold its full power for blessing unto man.

In the meantime Cardinal Caraffa, the chief representative of the anti-protestant tendency, had become the most influential personality at Rome. The Jesuits assisted him. In 1536 they had come to Italy, and were recognized as an order by the Pope in 1540; and now they began their quiet, wisely directed work, with all energy, which knew but one purpose, the annihilation of Protestantism. The reform plans of Contarini were no longer considered. Instead of carrying them out, the Bull of July 21st, 1542, renewed the inquisition, and established a general high tribunal with authority to shed blood, at the head of which stood Caraffa. We can date the beginning of the Counter-Reformation from this day. Caraffa, a man of iron will, strict with himself and with others, now pushed the work of mercilessly freeing Italy from heretics, and then, having become Pope Paul IV in 1555, placed the highest power of the Church wholly in the service of this enterprise. Whoever was suspected of any protestant heresy was brought by the inquisition before the tribunal, and this tribunal knew no class distinctions and showed no pity, no forbearance. Many escaped by flight, many sealed their faith with their death. No book dared be printed or sold without the permission of the

inquisition; all books brought in from abroad must be submitted for examination, and a catalogue of forbidden books, the notorious *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, informed the faithful what books they were not permitted to read. He who had such a book and did not surrender it fell under the inquisition. Whole heaps of heretical books were burned. Certain works, e. g. the *Benefit of Christ*, already mentioned, were almost wholly destroyed. But it would not be just to Paul IV not to recognize the fact that he did bring about some reform. He freed the Curia from elements of uncleanness; the papacy has been different from his day; the former secularization has ceased. He restored divine service and gave it new splendor; he held the clergy to preaching and cared for the instruction of the young, in which the Jesuits came to his assistance, who more and more controlled instruction, preaching and the confessional. Pius IV continued that which Paul IV had begun. Under him the Tridentine Council, and with it the restoration of Catholicism, came to an end. This longest of all councils (it lasted from 1546 until 1563 with many interruptions) made the dogma of modern Catholicism. In opposition to the Protestant principle, it gave tradition like authority with Holy Scripture, and thereby established the principle of the authority of the Church. In order to be a Catholic now one must believe what the infallible Church teaches. In opposition to justification by faith alone, it set up a doctrine of justification, which, it is true, sprang from various compromises with a tendency that inclined more to the Protestant conception, and therefore was veiled and cautiously expressed, but which left room for human action along side of grace, and for meritorious work along side of faith, and thus opened the door for the old work-righteousness and sanctioned the Pelagian leaven. Thereby is the certainty of salvation transferred from the believing Christian to the Church, as a priestly institution of sacraments. Through the sacraments administered by her priests she transfers grace into man and guarantees salvation to him, under the condition that he follow her obediently. The Council of Trent also fixed the doctrine of the sacraments in all points, and thus established the whole sacramental mechanism of the modern

Catholic Church. Reformational decrees accompanied those concerning doctrine. And we cannot deny that through them many abuses were removed and many good and beneficial regulations were made; but if the council at the beginning awakened the hope that the days of Canossa and Basel would be renewed, or that it would place a restriction on the hierarchy, and especially on the papacy, this hope was completely disappointed. With the help of the princes, and, above all, of the Jesuits, who already played a most important role, the Pope succeeded in getting the council wholly into his hands during its last period, and eventually the result was the complete confirmation of the papal authority. Episcopatism was completely overcome, and, although the council did not dare to express directly the infallibility of the Pope, it was nevertheless really recognized. The Pope was commissioned to confirm and execute the decrees of the Council, *i. e.*, they recognized unequivocally that the Pope stood over the council.

Jan. 26th, 1565, the Pope confirmed the decrees of the council, which closed the reform movement in the Catholic Church. The modern Catholic Church stands before us. If I should characterize it in its differences from the Church of the Middle Ages, I would say that out of the Catholic Church has come the Roman Church. The Germanic element has been removed. The Germanic people have not cooperated in the restoration of the Church, it has been the work of the Romance nations, and accordingly the Church that came forth from this restoration has throughout a Romance character. The preponderance of fantasy and the increasing sensualization of the cultus are Romance; the Germanic depth of soul-life is wanting. The losing of the individual in the whole, the patterned and disciplinary element of modern Catholic piety are Romance. The conscience of the Church takes the place of personal conscience; the confessional has a meaning that it did not have in the Middle Ages; the father confessor takes away from the individual member of the congregation his responsibility for his action, but with it he loses also his freedom in choosing for himself. The Germanic tendency toward individualism, the Germanic way of defending and emphasizing the right of the

individual personality, has disappeared. The strong impulse toward external activity, which brought forth such a beautiful, rich fruitage in the new Catholic Church, but also the externalizing of the religious life which is connected with it, is also Romantic. The Germanic inwardness is not present. The Church of the Middle Ages became Romanic also in this sense, that now the principle that dominates everything is that of the authority of the Roman Bishop, as the visible head of the Church. The whole Church is concentrated in him, he alone rules, and all other organs of the Church are instruments alongside of him, that enforce his decisions and carry out his will. These two characteristics are constitutive for the post-tridentine Catholic Church, and appear even sharper and more one-sided in the struggle against Protestantism. The Germanic element becomes even more and more separated, and the authority of the Pope even more sharply expressed. You see now already that the Vatican Council only completed that which the Council of Trent began.

This renewed Catholicism now took up the struggle with Protestantism. The situation was extremely unfavorable for it and victory dared scarcely be hoped for. All Europe was filled with reformation thoughts that had gone out from Wittenberg. The Evangelical Church had consolidated itself; not only in North and East Germany, but in the South and West, all, who through social standing or mental capacity, were of consequence, were inclined toward reformation. In Bavaria almost the entire nobility and almost all civil officers were Lutheran, and the same was true of Austria. The bishops of Cologne, Mayence, Treves, Wuertzburg and Bamberg were scarcely able to maintain the Catholic Church. Cloisters had become empty; church institutions had declined. The old representatives of Catholicism, the opponents of Luther, were dying, and a younger generation had not yet appeared. In Vienna for twenty years no student of the ministry had received priestly consecration. At most one-tenth of the entire population of all Germany, Austria and Hungary, held to the old Church; all the districts that to-day are strictly Catholic, Steiermark, Kaernten, Upper and Lower Austria, Wuertzburg

and Bamberg, were Lutheran. It seemed as if only a little time was needed for the Reformation to have a complete victory in the German countries, for the old Church to be fully uprooted. Outside of Germany the whole Northland belonged to Protestantism. The Lutheran Church was firmly established in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and in the Baltic Provinces. England was separated from Rome. The Gospel had many adherents in the Netherlands and in France. In 1563 the Venetian Ambassador found three-fourths of the country filled with them. The Gospel had forced its way victoriously over the Alps and the Pyrenees. Spain and, to a greater extent, Italy, were permeated with Protestant ideas.

The first thing was to clear Italy and Spain of Protestants. The Inquisition succeeded in doing this by a bloody severity that knew no mercy. By about 1570 every agitation of the evangelical spirit in these countries had been choked. Then the Roman Church won a firm foothold in Germany, helped especially by the Jesuits, the Spanish monks, as they were well named there. In 1563 they came into Ingolstat. Bavaria became once more a Catholic country. This encouraged the bishops of Wuertzburg and Bamberg to cleanse their realms of heretics: on the Rhine, in Cologne, in Treves, the old Church was restored. The Jesuits were the tools everywhere; they preached, erected schools and used the confessional. Provincial synods were held, the clergy was renewed, the cloisters were reformed. The empty churches were filled again, the old ceremonies came once more into use, the shrines were again visited by pilgrims; in a word, vigorous Catholic life woke up anew, and a great part of Germany was turned away again from Protestantism, for which it was in part responsible, for while the Catholic Church proceeded unitedly and with closed ranks, the Protestants suffered from divisions and inner disputes, while with the former a religious life really glowed again, and a readiness for self sacrificing helped to advance the work and the struggle. (It would not be right to refuse to recognize that in the Jesuits of that day). With the latter the life that



had been awakened by the Reformation was already declining and growing cold.

It was different in France and the Netherlands. There they employed force. For there Rome had understood how to win the princes for her cause, and they considered the Protestants rebels, who must be suppressed with power. The century of religious wars begins, which filled Europe with blood and ruin. At first it really seemed as if the world would be subjected to the Pope once more. Alba restored the Church in the Netherlands. England became Catholic again under the Bloody Mary. But then the people of the Netherlands rose up for their faith and their freedom, and in England Elizabeth established the Protestant Church permanently. The storm scattered the invincible Armada, Spain's power declined; in France the Edict of Nantes gave the Protestants almost the rights of a state within a state. Though Catholicism did not attain its ends, it was thoroughly well established and had greatly increased its territory. On the other hand, the Protestants had also joined themselves more closely together. Europe was divided into two worlds, a Protestant and a Catholic; the final decisive conflict was inevitable. Our fatherland became the stage of the most bloody and most destructive of all wars, in which both parties struggled in deadly conflict with each other for thirty years. It seemed as if Protestantism was lost; the Catholic armies ruled Germany as far as the Baltic; the Jesuits followed in their wake in order to reestablish the old Church; by the edict of restoration of 1629 the church property was again taken from the Protestants, even in our own country, which had not seen a monk for almost one hundred years, the cloisters were again restored. Then the arrival of Gustavus Adolphus brought the change. A few years before the victorious Catholic armies stood on the Baltic; now Gustavus Adolphus penetrated as far as Bavaria and Tyrol, and the Swedes stood on the Italian borders; a few years before they thought of the restoration of the bishoprics and cloisters in North Germany, now Gustavus Adolphus was thinking of converting the South German bishoprics into civil Protestant states. Although

after the death of Gustavus Adolphus the conditions were again more favorable for the Catholic Church, she could not think of overcoming Protestantism by force. Such plans had to be given up forever. The Peace of Westphalia settled the boundaries for both churches, which have suffered little change since then.

It is interesting to ask why these grandly conceived plans of the Catholic Church must fail. The answer is not uncertain. The Roman Church did not have power enough in it to overcome Protestantism. That which she had experienced was only a restoration, not a reformation. The powers awakened by a mere restoration do not last long, they do not spring from a deep source. A genuinely new life was not there. With the Protestants such a new life was really present, therefore they were invincible as soon as this new life stirred mightily. Because her own inner strength was not sufficient, the Roman Church called in the power of princes, and hoped to be made victorious by shrewd political combinations. And in fact this helped them at times to important successes, but then, on the other hand, new political constellations brought defeat. We can say that the Roman Church was not able to bear the victories that she did not win with her own strength. Had the Catholic powers remained united against Gustavus Adolphus, he would have been ground to powder. But the victories of the Emperor awakened the jealousies of the other Catholic powers and of the Pope himself. The French favored Gustavus Adolphus, and at the fatal diet in Regensburg, in 1630, the Pope protected the opposition to the Emperor, which interfered with him. At the decisive moment the politics of the Pope and the interests of his temporal principality stood above the interests of the Church. This was the punishment that the Roman Church suffered for not seeking to win its victories by spiritual weapons, but by temporal power.

But Rome suffered still greater punishment. From the Peace of Westphalia on matters became continually worse with her. The whole age has now become different. The religious element, which for one hundred and fifty years had been the

predominant factor and had stirred up the nations, receded, and from now on political considerations alone rule the world. And with this, the role that the Pope thus far had played in European politics was at an end; it has become impossible to overwhelm Protestantism by political combinations. It is true, the Pope protested solemnly against the Peace of Westphalia, but who pays any attention to it? In Rome they did not give up the thought of winning back again the Protestant districts. Now they aim at the conversion of individual princes and important personages, and they had some success. It was a great triumph when the daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, Queen Christine, renounced the faith for which her father had fought and died, and returned to the bosom of the Catholic Church. The reigning house in Electoral Saxony, once the head of the evangelicals, bought the crown of Poland by its going over. From the house of the Guelphs they succeeded in winning Anton Ulrich and Johann Friedrich, and in our castle church mass was read again. Even conferences concerning union were brought about. The Bishop Spinola von Tina traveled around to the courts of the Hohenzollerns and the Guelphs to begin weaving the plans; Leibnitz and the Abbott Gerhard Molanus negotiated with Bossuet. But it all was without results, especially because the Protestant countries had become strongly developed in all directions, while the Catholic lands had declined and were poorer.

The Catholic Church also declined rapidly inwardly. Under the influence of the Jesuits, religious life retrograded, cultus became more external, while its ethics, which amounts to nothing more than to make it as easy as possible for man to fulfil his duties, did great injury to the moral life. The reaction of Jansenism against this, which arose in France as a return to Augustinian thoughts concerning grace, and in opposition to Jesuitism emphasized the deepening of the religious life, and strove to give more earnestness to the moral life, was crushed with force; and this was another victory that cost the Catholic Church a part of the evangelical life that still remained in her. The Curia in Rome, after its plans for overcoming the world

had failed, became a place of money-making and pleasure, and in the courts of the spiritual princes in Germany it was still worse. Von Poellnitz, who about 1730 visited the German courts, informed the spiritual court in Fulda concerning the price of drinking, and said that he never left the Bishop's table in Wuertzburg in any other condition than that of complete unconsciousness. The archbishop of Cologne, Joseph Clemens, (1688 to 1723), declared that he would read no more masses and perform no more spiritual acts if his father confessor should wish to hinder him from associating with his mistress. His successor, Clemens August, spent his time with singing and dancing girls; even in France the court in Bonn was notorious because of its frivolity. And yet the archbishop was churchly devout, held firmly to a strict observance of the church usages, gave away many images of Mary, and, when he believed he had been bitten by a mad dog, made a pilgrimage to the stola of St. Hubertus in the hope of finding a remedy there. Such bishops could not hinder the decay of the ecclesiastical and religious life, and already the flood roared near at hand which shook both churches to their foundations, and threatened to sweep away every positive form of Christianity, without respect to its confessional coloring, and for a time put an end to the struggle of the confessions among themselves—Illuminism, and in its wake the Revolution.

It was in France, where under Louis XIV the civil government had suppressed the Protestants and the Jansenists with force, and where the Jesuits had absolute sway, that a philosophy arose, which, recognizing nothing save that which man with his five senses can perceive, persecuted religion and Church with bitter scorn, and strove with every possible intellectual weapon to put an end to "infamous" Christianity. Voltaire, Diderot, Helvetius, the most noted of the encyclopedists, became the ruling spirits in the cultured circles, not only of France, but of all Europe, and it was rather Protestantism that was strong enough to oppose this power than the externalized, bigotly Jesuitical Catholicism.

The order of the Jesuits itself fell as the next offering.

They were first driven from Portugal, then in 1764 they were banished from France by a decree of the parliament; the other Bourbon courts followed, and, urged by them, Pope Clement XIV disbanded the order Aug. 26th, 1773, by the bull *Dominus ac Redemptor Noster*. "Inspired by the Holy Ghost, as we trust," so the bull reads, "driven by our duty to restore the harmony of the Church, convinced that the Society of Jesus can no longer render the service for which it was established—we abolish and annul the Society of Jesus, its offices, houses and institutions." That is, the Church now, through her head, gives up the order which really had been established for opposing Protestantism. Thereby she gave up further struggle, and even did away with that which stood in the way of opposition to the Church. The papacy really gave itself up in giving up the order that always defended the most extreme conception of the supremacy of the papacy. Then it had no influence for some decades, and, unhindered, the new ideas could make themselves felt even in the Roman Church.

We dare not overlook the fact that this thought also belonged to the tenets of Illuminism, that the state is omnipotent, and that it is its duty to "illumine" the people by laws, in order, as they thought, to do away with all evil and make the people absolutely happy with this advancing Illuminism. Accordingly "Illumined" despotism applied itself to improving the Church with an unbridled zeal for reform. Joseph II consistently followed out the plan of freeing the Church in Austria from every external influence; schools became institutions of Illuminism for the people; of the two thousand cloisters thirteen hundred were closed, and their property was used for benevolent purposes; pilgrimages and other churchly ceremonies were given over to ridicule, or plainly forbidden. He was followed by his brother, Max Frantz, the archbishop of Cologne, who brought the leaders of Illuminism to his court and broke completely with Rome. In like manner Illuminism was spread in other bishoprics, especially in Bavaria. In Ems the four archbishops came to an understanding concerning the basis of a national church free from Rome. Even in Italy reforms were consum-

mated. In Tuscany the affairs of the Church were readjusted by the Bishop of Pistoja. A synod decided upon the abolition of all superstitious ceremonies, the holding of the service in the language of the people and the spreading of the Holy Scriptures. Everywhere they strove to set aside or to tone down that which was specifically Catholic, but unfortunately that which took its place was not the Gospel, but the superficial ideas of the time of Illuminism. The people passively bore it all, which showed how little influence the Roman Church exerted over them, in spite of all the external devotion.

If the Catholic Church was already undermined, the Revolution and the succeeding times of war overthrew its form of government. By the decree of the royal deputation of 1803 the spiritual bishoprics of Germany were secularized, the Church-State became a Roman republic, and then a part of the French empire, and the Pope was taken to France as a prisoner. It looked as if the papacy had been set aside forever, and the confessional struggle buried. Catholics and Protestants extended the fraternal hand to each other over the ruins of the Church; but that which united them was not a common faith, but a common indifference to positive Christianity; the ground on which they came together was not the fullness of evangelical truth, but that which Illuminism had left remaining of Christianity, the few depleted ideas, that at that time were summed up in the Trinity, God, Freedom and Immortality. Yet, in this way the struggle, which was of so much importance for the history of the world, and had extended through centuries, could not pass away; it must revive again as soon as the churches revive. And once more they took on new life.

Of course at first there was little or nothing to be detected of the old opposition between the two churches. It was non-Catholic powers that brought the Pope back to Rome and restored to him the Church-State; and Protestant princes willingly met him in his effort to restore the desolate and dissolved Church in their lands. Throne and altar suffered together in the Revolution; now in the time of restoration, both were to be restored together, and the thought prevailed quite generally,

that altar and throne must support each other. The reawakened Christian life in both Churches bore as yet little confessional character. People were happy to have religious life again only in a general way, and made little inquiry as to whether it was Protestant or Catholic. It was a time when Hamann and the princes of Gallitzen extended to each other the fraternal hand, when Perthes was an intimate friend of Catholics, and the Bishop Sailer, in view of Tholuck's activity as pastor of the German embassy in Rome, expressed his joy in the fact that the Holy Father permitted the Gospel to be preached; a time when people even in the Catholic Church took in hand the work of spreading the Scriptures, and, in fact, here and there worked in common with Protestants, as for example, in the call for the founding of a Bible Society in Osnabrueck, the names of the Lutheran city superintendent and the Catholic bishop standing peacefully alongside of each other. Roman Catholicism and pietistically colored Protestantism were closely related to each other; Romanticism became the bridge for individual Protestants that led them over to Catholicism, and on the other hand, a strong evangelical tendency made itself felt in the Catholic Church, and at that time many Catholics found their way into the evangelical Church. In general, the Catholic Church of the first decades of the last century bore throughout a mild, placable character. They paid little attention to pilgrimages and relic worship, and were suspicious toward the Jesuits, often directly hostile. The Catholics of that time would know nothing of an absolute papal power, sought to stand in a peaceful relation toward the Protestants, and believed in all earnestness in a reconciliation with the fundamental principles of the modern state.

On the other hand, in Rome they started at once on very different ways; here they thought only of a complete restoration of the old without reserve. Scarcely had the Pope returned to Rome when he restored the order of the Jesuits by the bull *Sollicitudo Omnium*, of Aug. 7th, 1814, in which he said he could not get along without the skilled oarsmen in the storms of the present, and with new zeal and old craftiness



they began their work at once. Although all else of the Church-State had been given back to him, the Pope protested against the decrees of the Council of Vienna, because Avignon did not fall to him again, and because of the secularization of the German bishoprics and cloisters. The statesmen smiled at this protest; they would have done better if they had recognized in it a symptom of the tendency that prevailed at Rome, and of the plans followed there. In Rome they wanted to give up nothing, and already regarded the restoration of the old temporal power as their goal. Soon enough it also appeared that the revived Catholicism, just as the former, turned against Protestantism. In France, under the white flag, it came again to persecution of the Protestants; the Pope himself declared the Bible societies a nuisance. Wherever it could be done in any way, the like privileging of Protestants with Catholics was set aside.

The restoration of Catholicism since then has been pressed with strictest consistency, and its promoters neither rest nor grow weary. With cold calculation every advantage has been used, every tendency of the times turned to the good of the Church. While the government was won by the thought that the strengthening of the Church also helped the temporal power, they understood just as well how to gain advantages from liberalism. The liberal current of 1848 above all else helped the Roman Church, and gave it such an independence over against the state as it never had before. For touching and winning the masses of the people, the old means were used, missions, the splendor of the mass, the creation of new saints, the increase of the worship of Mary and relics, new miracles and appearances of the Madonna; modern means were also used, instruction of the young and the press. And in fact Rome can look back on a series of victories, of which no one would have dreamed at the beginning of the century. In France every trace of Gallicanism is obliterated. Churchly societies of every sort are among the people; the cult of the Heart of Jesus and the cult of the Heart of Mary are so widely extended, that one might conclude that the Church of France is the Church of Mary. And however the governments

changed in this deeply agitated land, the Church understood how to draw each one into her service. The hierarchy is restored in England, in the contest concerning mixed marriages. In Prussia she won an important victory even over the state. But the important thing is, that the old Catholic, one might say the Germanic Catholic, tendency is wholly supplanted by the ultramontane Jesuistical tendency.

The longest of all papal reigns, that of Pius IX, has this meaning for the history of the world: During it the ultramontane, Jesuistical Catholicism triumphed completely over that which people now are inclined to call the liberal Catholicism, but which is more accurately named the Germanic and evangelically tending Catholicism. At first, himself a liberal, Pius IX was compelled to taste the bitter fruits of the Revolution and go into exile, from which he returned a different man. December 8th, 1854, he proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, and thereby brought the development of the cult of Mary to a definite close. Then in 1864 he published the Syllabus, in which he rejected all the ideas of the new age, even that of freedom of cult and conscience, and proclaimed the absolute authority of the Church, even her right to use force against unbelief and error, asserted her authority over science and schools, and even expressly condemned the opinion that the Roman Church can become reconciled with modern civilization. Then at the Vatican council followed the declaration of the infallibility of the Pope. During a violent storm, on the eighteenth of July, 1870, in the aula of the council, darkened by the storm while it was thundering and lightening, the dogma was announced, "that the Pope, when he speaks from his chair, *i. e.*, when he in exercise of his office as shepherd and teacher of all Christians, announces a doctrine concerning faith and morals to be held by the entire Church, commands with infallibility, and that all such decrees of the Roman Pope of themselves, but not by the approval of the Church, are unimprovable."

On the next day, by a wonderful providence of God, the Franco-Prussian War broke out, which compelled Napoleon III

to recall his troops from Rome, who, until then, had protected the Pope against his own people. On the tenth of September the Italians entered Rome through Porta Pia; the temporal power of the Pope was at an end; Rome had become the Capital of united Italy. Thereby was the spiritual power of the Pope only increased. The prisoner in the Vatican, wearing the martyr's crown, won the more power over the hearts of the faithful. The outbreak of the Kulturkampf helped over the difficulties that were in the way of carrying out the decrees of the Vatican council. It offered the German Bishops an opportunity, by so much greater firmness over against the state, to make good that lack of firmness which they had shown at the council, when they did not dare to give full expression to their convictions, and to vote openly against a dogma, which they, until that time, had opposed, and which many of them still regarded as unfounded in Scripture and tradition. The years of the struggle increased their authority and made bishops, clergy, and congregations one complete unit, which the State could not break, and against which the smaller number of those who, holding to Catholicism in conscientious loyalty to conviction, went out from the Church, and as the Old Catholic Church opposed the Vatican Church, was and remained of little importance. The state itself was compelled to set aside its new legislation, in which it believed it had set up an insurmountable obstacle to Rome's claims. And however one may judge of this unfortunate struggle and the still more unfortunate treaty of peace, one thing is certain, it increased wonderfully the power and the confidence of victory of the Roman Church. United as never before, having the infallible Pope at the head, led by bishops who have sacrificed to the unity of the Church every former thought of independence and are and want to be only vicars of the Pope, with a clergy that is trained wholly in ultramontane thoughts, equipped with means that have influence in the present—great wealth and a well organized press, from the largest newspaper to the smallest local journal, with a network of societies that embrace the entire life of the people, with widely branched, craftily led benevo-

lent operations sustained by great readiness for sacrifice—she awaits now with certainty the long desired victory over Protestantism; he believes she has it in her hands already. According to a decision of Cardinal Manning, "the Council of Trent fixed the period, after which Protestantism ceased to spread; the Vatican Council will mark the period of its death."

This brings us to the present. We have attempted to give a summary, though only in simplest outline, of the opposition between Protestantism and Catholicism and of the struggle that has lasted for centuries. We will now draw some conclusions from it.

So much is clear, the development took with proper historical sequence. The way which was entered upon in the time of the Reformation, could not but lead with inner necessity to the Roman Catholic Church as it stands to day. That which was begun at the Council of Trent was completed at the Vatican Council. The Church is not wholly Romanized. It is suggestive, that almost all German bishops and those who had come in contact with German culture, that almost all noted Catholic scholars in Germany, were opposed to the dogma of infallibility. They have withdrawn, or have been broken by superior power. In fact, of the 764 members of the Council, only 19 were Germans against 276 Italians. The German element in the Church has been definitely suppressed. The principle of authority has been driven to extremes; tradition is incarnate in the Pope. Pius IX could say, "I am tradition." Christ himself is present in the Pope. The verse is already applied to him: "Lord, to whom shall we go, Thou alone hast the words of eternal life." Already some speak of an incarnation of Christ in the Pope, of a three-fold incarnation of God in Christ, in the sacrament of the altar and in the Pope; and the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the journal of the Pope, has assured us that when the Pope reflects, God thinks in him. Thereby has the Catholic Church become the papal Church. The old Catholic sentence: "That is Christian which always, everywhere and before all has been taught in the Church," has been changed into: That is Christian which the Pope prescribes to be believed. The Church has become a papal theocracy.

With this the opposition to Protestantism has reached an extreme stage. The papal Church can have and follow no other goal than the annihilation of Protestantism, which in its eyes is the greatest godlessness. Of course we know that individual Catholics teach differently, that they preach toleration, even toward Protestants, and we can appreciate it full well, but it is only an honest inconsistency, by which we dare not allow ourselves to be rocked to sleep in supposed security. It is a remnant of the liberal, I may say of the German, Catholicism, whose sentence of death was pronounced at the Vatican Council. The Roman Church cannot be tolerant. For it we are of the devil, as the Roman Catechism expressly says, and the Syllabus attributes to the Church even the right to use force against the heretics. Even Leo XIII, much praised as the Pope of peace, declared Protestantism to be the kingdom of darkness (as Pope he cannot do otherwise), called Luther a "heresiarch and godless apostate," and mentioned as part of his pastoral responsibility "to restore to unity the nations who sinfully had separated themselves from it."

Even to-day Rome is working for this end with all her power, and let us not deceive ourselves in regard to the danger that threatens us. The Roman Church is more unified than ever; all differences in her, that often in the past crippled her in decisive moments, have disappeared, at least for the present; she resembles a closely concentrated army, in which the order of the commander sets every one down to the lowest in rank, in motion according to the fixed plan. The Pope, after the loss of the temporal power, has become only the more the spiritual head, and the German bishops, since they are no longer princes of the empire, are again the real bishops, about whom there still shines the old glory of the mighty Church. The Roman Church has a clergy, that scientifically and morally stands much higher than that of the former century; she has brought the masses of the people together into a party that has shown itself to be firmer than all others; she has hosts of brothers and sisters of mercy, brothers and sisters who work in the schools, monks and nuns, all of whom are sustained by the power of the Church, and in their enthusiasm are ready to of-

fer even their lives for her. In Prussia alone between 1880 and 1885 the number of the sisters of mercy increased 4000. Thus the Roman Church advances in Protestant countries, builds churches, increases the number of her priests, equips hospitals, establishes cloisters, provides a press and, with a theocratic socialism, seeks to bring the laboring masses to her interests; she even tries to gain for herself the social question, which is the problem of the century. Catholic journals already call Leo XIII "the social Pope," and ascribe to him the words "The salvation of the future rests in the laborer," and "Social regeneration will come from the laboring classes." Accordingly along with the combination of enthusiasm and worldly craftiness, so characteristic for modern Catholicism, the plan is followed which a Catholic author mentions in the following words: "We will collect the Catholics in the North German districts, and give them financial support, so that they can sustain Catholicism and become pioneers for advance. With a net of Catholic associations we will place a clasp around the old Protestant hearth in Prussia from the East and from the West, and by a number of cloisters fasten these clasps, and thereby crush Protestantism."

What do we have now with which to oppose all this? Only one thing, the Gospel, but that is even mightier than Rome with all her power and with all her arts. Let us make it clear on what the results rest which the Roman Church has attained in recent times. Perhaps on the fact that the Gospel and its power over the spirit have again greater influence in her, that those elements of Christian truth and Christian life, which she still possesses, have become more powerful? No, it is just the opposite. Her success depends on the fact that the unevangelical, and therefore the unchristian, elements in her, that is, her errors, have become stronger. That which occurred at the time of the Reformation and has repeated itself in the history of the Roman Church in every important period since then, has occurred in our days, the Roman Church has concentrated herself, but this concentration shows itself in her spiritual poverty. She has become mightier as a world power, but

poorer in evangelical content, in Christian life. She paid for her growth by losing a part of that true Christianity which was still in her, and by becoming more thoroughly established in her errors. Those results were attained, not by that in the Roman Church which is yet church, but by that which is world. Accordingly those who know no other might than world power may gaze at those results, or worry about them, or even feel attracted to them; we, who know the power of the Gospel and believe the words of the apostle, "greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world," we know that those results in reality are only seeming results, and that this power, in distinction from the Gospel, is only world power, and consequently only seemingly mighty. Let history teach us here. Rome's tactics are still the same as in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, only, of course, they are suited to the changed conditions. In reality she doubts her own strength and seeks to have the help of temporal powers, and to win by crafty politics. In parliaments, as well as before the masses, she asserts herself as a world power, and thus compels nations to stipulate with her, and then with her calculation makes use of every political situation. It is true that may lead to temporal results, as in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but other political constellations, just as at that time, will bring the greater defeats, and judgment will not tarry. Religious forces are not placed in the service of worldly powers without penalty, they perish thereby, and the result will be that just here in Germany the religious life that still remains in the Catholic Church will die off, just the same as in the Roman nations, and degenerate into forms and ceremonial service. The fact that the Roman Church exercises so little influence in those lands where it has solitary sway, is unanswerable proof that she declines and does not advance as a spiritual power. Therefore let us not fear, not even in the much famed results of Rome in recent years. Because we are certain that the Reformation was born of the Gospel, we can also be certain that the Roman Church will not succeed in her renewed attempt to nullify the work of the Reformation.



But of course we dare not allow our hands to be idle, we must fight and work. Rome is not afraid of mere words. It is not for us who stand in the truth of the Gospel, to scold or to bluster in blind zeal, for truth makes us firm and certain, and at the same time just and mild. Let me earnestly warn against being misled in our struggle with Rome, so that we fall to using the same means she uses; against striving after and vieing with Rome in worldly power and splendor; against stirring up agitation in order to counteract her agitations. In these things we could not equal Rome and would only lose our own power. For that is worldly and not spiritual, it is the way of the world-Church and not of the evangelical Church. But being firmly rooted in the Gospel, we should labor to the end that the Gospel be brought to our people. That our nation in so many places, that our large cities, that our laboring classes are so neglected in church matters, that there is need of churches and preachers, this is our great sin that, in our struggle with Rome, avenges itself severely. The chief concern is, to do everything in order to make amends for this sin, to bring the Gospel again among the people, so that out of the power of the Gospel there may be born believing, living congregations, to do everything to foster and advance congregational life. For the power that Rome cannot overwhelm is the believing congregation, founded on and collected around the Gospel.

Here belongs also all that which we bring under the general name of Inner Missions, for, whatever conditions of need it may relieve in individual instances, its chief task is to permeate the life of the people with the power of the Gospel. Just at present Inner Missions has a great responsibility in our struggle with Rome. To-day Rome uses against us the influence of Christian benevolent work much more extensively than ever before. Let us not be deceived, even benevolent work in the Roman Church is, to a certain degree, plainly directed against us as is shown by the fact that the beginners and founders of the new Catholic benevolent operations, Karl Borromeo, Vinzenz von Paula, Frantz von Sales, all are famed as having been great converters of heretics. The Roman Church hopes to

gain much by this means, for, as Vinzenz von Paula says, "there is no protection against humility and love," and it would be dangerous blindness for us not to recognize how great things the Roman Church has accomplished in this field. Even we must legitimate our faith by its fruits, we must contend for the prize with the Roman Church, which does the most for the people. Every deaconess, everybody who helps in works of mercy, is a champion for the Gospel against Rome on the very field where the struggle will be decided, for it will not be decided by learned discussions and by polemic writings concerning the different dogmas, but by active faith, that brings fruits and exercises love.

The purpose of this is to strengthen us in this faith, to make us conscious of what great blessings we owe the Reformation, and the result for which we hope and pray is not that we, in self-exultation, look down upon our Catholic brethren, nor cherish want of love, or hate toward them, who are also Christians, also children of our own people, but rather that we, as children of the Reformation, become conscious of our holy duty to stand up for it and to help to preserve its blessings for our children and successors.

## ARTICLE VI.

## DR. CREMER ON THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY C. E. HAY, D.D.

No earnest Christian, observant of the course of critical thought, can fail to feel a peculiar interest in that phase of modern discussion which would open anew the question of the divinity of Christ. It is not surprising that in an era when the mind of man has burst the shackles of many earlier beliefs and has grown accustomed to the thought of historic development operating through long periods of time and in accordance with great cosmic laws, there should be a renewed effort to reduce the unique personality and work of Christ to the plane of the natural and explicable, nor that such an effort should be hastily greeted by many as a forward movement in the emancipation of thought.

The lectures of Dr. A. Harnack delivered at Berlin in the winter of 1899-1900 and published under the title: *The Essence of Christianity*, embody this modern tendency in an alluring form. The high station of the author, his reputation as an intelligent student of history, particularly of religious and ecclesiastical history, and the easy sweep of his literary style in broad generalizations have contributed to give a popularity to this brief course of lectures out of proportion to any measure of originality or substantial force which may rightly be accorded them.

A direct reply to such a series of Kaleidoscopic portraitures of the leading phases of religious development since the days of Christ would be exceedingly difficult. There is much in the trenchant criticism of externalism and ultra-conservatism with which all intelligent readers must sympathize. To separate the truth from the error in the broad assertions, to correct at every point the distorted judgments resulting from the illogical denial in advance of the possibility of the super-natural would require volumes.

Critics in Germany have generally contented themselves with pointing out the defects in the premises of the author and the inadequacy of the method pursued by him, maintaining with much force that conclusions thus reached must be open to grave suspicion. As the Lectures are semi-popular in form, the majority of the theologians who have risen in defense of the accepted doctrine have also written in popular style, aiming to present the evangelical position in a positive way as the only one adequately accounting for the plain facts of history.

This is the character of the Twelve Lectures delivered by Dr. Herman Cremer to the students of all faculties at Greifswald in the summer of 1901, which, published under the same caption as those of Dr. Harnack, have passed through a number of editions. That such clear and fervent statements of the distinctly evangelical view of fundamental Christian truth should find wide popular acceptance in Germany is a cheering evidence that the Church in the Fatherland is still strongly held to her ancient moorings.

The author notes a parallel between the attempt of Harnack and that made by Schleiermacher precisely one hundred years before, in his *Discourses upon Religion*, both being addressed chiefly to cultured unbelievers, with the important difference, however, that the latter had to do with an alienation from Christianity, due to rationalism, the former with a similar alienation due to the preaching of the Gospel itself. In seeking to win back these wanderers from the fold, Dr. Harnack has, it is claimed, surrendered the essential features of the Gospel. While professing to follow distinctly historical methods, he starts with a dogmatic conception of what he thinks to be correct in the historic accounts of the New Testament, and then proceeds to trace the history of this conception in the doctrine and life of the Church. Dr. Cremer proposes to inquire "how the New Testament view of Jesus Christ originated, to sketch its leading features, and to present the evidence for its truthfulness in the only way in which, according to his own conviction, it can be presented."

The first lecture states the problem, in the pregnant query: *Which Christianity?* We are in the midst of a struggle more

momentous and severe, with possible exception of the first Christian centuries and the era of the Reformation, than the Church has ever known. It is the conflict of two diverse religions. The contestants on the one side regard Christ as a regular, ordinary character in history, in the course of which he emerged, exerted and still exerts an influence, just as every other historical personage, except that he excelled all others in endowment, and with unique and absolute fidelity, utilized this endowment, with the knowledge of God and of the world to which it led him, to set forth that combination of motives and aims which can alone solve the riddles of our human life and of the world and point the way to a happy consummation. He is the man in whom goodness has been realized in the world, and this realization of goodness should prevent us from despairing of its possibility. As we contemplate the divine providence which produced such a man, we should regard the forgiveness of our own errors and sins as thereby assured, rejoice in the knowledge of God which we thus gain, and, with faith in this great deed of God, strive to attain a like realization of goodness in our own lives. The opposing party regards Christ as an irregular, extraordinary character in history. The place which he holds is absolutely unique. It belongs to him, not because he is human—sprung from our race, but because he became a man by entering our race. He was, before he became. He was and is eternally God, and has united himself forever with us and our race. He thereby became our brother, sharing with us our misery and condemnation, in order that we in our very deepest distresses might be consoled by the compassion of an almighty, symphasizing Saviour. Which party is in the right?

It is justly said that to discover the essential nature of Christianity we must go back to the period of its first appearance and to the form in which it won its first great victories. But, where is the point of time when Christianity began? Do we find the beginning of Christianity in the appearance and activity of the person, Jesus Christ? Is it the religion which he practiced and taught, to whose cultivation he pointed the way, and which he by his preaching enkindled in the hearts of his

hearers? Or, is the power which issues from Christ, and which is still to-day producing Christianity, something more than the religion which he himself practiced? Clearly the latter. The New Testament portrays indeed the religious life of Christ—his faith, his habit of prayer and his holy conduct; but it lays the chief stress upon that which he does for us. He is not, as we are, a subject of religion, but the Object of religion and of Christianity. He is not a man of history, who *lived*, as others live, whose significance is to be estimated by what they were for their own generations and by the influence still exerted by their words and characters and deeds. We are told nothing of after-influences of Christ's life and activity, but only of influences exerted by him after the close of his earthly life from his present dwelling-place, the dwelling-place of God. That which has been reported to us of the earthly activity of Christ is but the beginning of his work, the purpose and meaning of which he is only now unfolding. This is of course, and must ever remain, absolutely without parallel in all history; but shall we on that account reject it in advance as unhistorical?

The history of Christ, as recorded in the New Testament, is inseparably interwoven with the record of events and deeds that could never occur in the fixed course of nature. Shall we maintain that in the very first proclamation of the Gospel a crown of legends had been woven and placed upon the brow of Christ, which we must resolutely tear away? There is no historic reason for such a procedure, which could be suggested only upon dogmatic grounds.

It must be borne in mind that it was not the Gospel which Jesus proclaimed, but the Gospel concerning Jesus, as the disciples proclaimed it, that conquered the world. To their preaching Christianity owes its existence and its place among the forces moulding the history of the race. Upon this preaching of the disciples are based all the original documents which we possess bearing upon the life of Christ. If they are not trustworthy, where and how shall we find the truth which Christ himself proclaimed? It can at best be discovered only by a severe process of critical study, and hence none but the scholarly can

attain a knowledge of true Christianity. Further, the elements to be excluded by such a process are the very elements which gave to apostolic preaching its pungency and power and in which all the various writers of the New Testament are in absolute agreement. There were differences among the apostles touching missionary praxis, but there is not the slightest trace of variance as to the mystery of the person of Christ, the efficacy of his sufferings for us, or his significance as deciding our eternal destiny and that of the whole world. The religion which eliminates these great supernatural truths is not Christianity.

The second lecture analyses the message proclaimed to the world by the apostles, finding its great central thought to be the forgiveness of sins through a crucified, divine Saviour. Paul declares that he will know nothing but Jesus the crucified, through whose blood we have the forgiveness of sins. John rejoices that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin. Peter says: "Ye know that ye were redeemed from your vain conversation \* \* \* with the precious blood of Christ." It is not the life which Jesus lived, but the death which he suffered, that saves us. Instead of permitting judgment to fall upon the world, he endured death, and came back to life that we, thus freed from sin, might live through him. He lives as our Divine Redeemer, and will come again to take to himself all those who have accepted him and worshiped him as "God over all, blessed forever." All this is very wonderful. To believe it is an impossibility for him whose ideas and beliefs are absolutely bound down to the regular course of events in nature and history, but not impossible for him who is ready to believe the most wonderful thing of all, the forgiveness of his own sins. It is, at all events, the apostolic conception of the essential in Christianity.

The preaching of Christ himself, as reported in the Gospels, is next carefully reviewed. The Forerunner, having announced that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, and having pointed to Christ, not as a new teacher or prophet, but as "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world," Christ, fully



ratifying this testimony, proclaims that in him the kingdom has come. He not only reveals the Father, but claims to himself to bring rest to sinning, burdened souls. To receive this, men must not only believe what he believes, but must come to him. This assumption is so extraordinary that it is only at the close of his ministry that Peter has a glimpse of its meaning and confesses: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." The dying thief apprehends rightly the Essence of Christianity when he hails the Lord as passing through the gateway of death to his eternal kingdom, and receives in response the pardon of his sins and a portion in the blessed life of paradise. After the resurrection the disciples understand many of the "strange sayings" of their Master which had been hidden from them and think of him, not as a subject and exemplar of religion, but as its Object. The Gospel of John dwells upon the eternal Sonship, not as a new element, but as fully involved in the Synoptic records. Both accounts present Jews, not, as in Harnack's view, as having himself no place in the Gospel, but as its very heart and center—the only Saviour from sin—the proper object of worship.

But modern critics take offense at this portraiture of Christ. It is not in accord with the ordinary course of human history. The resurrection of Jesus, in particular, is entirely without analogy, and must therefore be discredited. The Jewish belief in a future life led to the idea of a resurrection from the dead and the early Christians not only attributed to Christ a participation in such resurrection but made him the first to experience it. With the denial of the resurrection of Christ disappears, of course, the significance for the forgiveness of sins. If our sins are ever to be forgiven, it will not be by virtue of the death of Christ, for his death ended his career. He was not, therefore, the Messiah foretold, the king of glory. We cannot believe that he really performed miracles; for miracles are not in harmony with our experience or with the ordinary course of history. His supposed miraculous birth is merely an attempt to explain his lofty character. He was a religious genius, embodying the best religious attainment of the past—so unsullied

in his purity that his enthusiastic followers imagined him divine.

With the divinity of Christ thus eliminated, Christianity becomes simply true religion, fellowship with God. It is promoted by Christ's three-fold proclamation, *i. e.*, of the fatherhood of God, the priceless value of the human soul, and the duty of love and the service of others. All else is temporary—scaffolding, crutches. Christ is the Messiah, the liberator from a religion that appealed to wrong motives and aims—the liberator of humanity from the conception of an angry God who must be propitiated by gifts and sacrifices. As his reverent faith made him one with God, God called and commissioned him as the representative man, through whom other men should learn to know God.

This reconstructed conception of Christ and the religion which bears his name is unfortunately open to two grave objections. It is not the result of a scientific study of the sources—not a product of historical criticism, but a result of the arbitrary application of a dogmatic principle, a principle, moreover, which is without warrant or relevancy in the case before us. It utterly discredits the apostolic testimony as to any event beyond the ordinary range of human occurrences, and it misrepresents Christ's own prescription for attaining fellowship with God: "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." Further, this reconstructed Gospel fails to meet human needs. It may be gratifying to intellectual pride and to the aesthetic sensibilities, but it does not satisfy the moral and religious nature. There is a matchless beauty in the merely human features of the life of Jesus. The lofty ideals which he presented and pursued furnish inspiration to holy and unselfish living; but neither the moral precepts which he taught nor the example of his exalted life can bring peace to the conscience-stricken sinner. The modern theory leaves the deepest longing of the soul unsatisfied. It is the peculiarity of the Christianity of the New Testament, on the contrary, that it addresses itself particularly to this need and presents Christ as the almighty friend and Saviour of sinners.

At this point the author introduces an interesting discussion

of the relation of faith to the acceptance of the scriptural narrative. The lecture is philosophically and theologically the most important of the series. It marks the parting of the ways, and indicates most clearly the fallacy of the vaunted but inadequate naturalistic method of interpretation.

How, it is asked, can faith in events of past history help us when our aim is to find truth vital for the present and assuring for the future? It is only through posthumous influence that Jesus can benefit us. If we have the truth he taught us, we need not be greatly concerned as to Christ himself, he being only a personage of history, the agency through which the truth has come to us. But we claim that Christ is more than a person of history, and, just because he is more, he satisfies our needs. It was the resurrection, as completing and explaining his whole life, that awakened faith in the disciples and that must awaken like faith in us. We believe in him as one who came into the course of human history for a season, but ever lives above it—the superhuman, superhistorical, living Lord, the Object of faith. The Gospel contains a paradox. It presents, not a factor in our own natural development, but a divine act to reverse and counteract our wrong development. Only in proportion to my sense of sin is my interest in this counteracting act of God, which appears in the resurrection as at once historical and more than historical—historically credible only because also more than historical. Thus all depends upon the resurrection of Christ, and our faith in the resurrection is morally conditioned. He who refuses to acknowledge his sin will never believe that Christ rose from the dead. The intellect at first hesitates to accept the resurrection because contrary to all other historical events—but it is the *will* that finally decides. Not that our will conditions or produces our faith; but our unwillingness produces unbelief, whereas the risen Jesus by his presence produces faith. "One may *be* unbelieving like Thomas, but can *remain* unbelieving only with a condemning conscience."

Casting aside then the prejudices of unbelief, we may without difficulty trace the essential features of Christianity as presented

in the New Testament. We shall find them all centering in Christ—in his person, his message, his miracles and his atoning work. To each of these an entire lecture is devoted. First of all, we recognize Christ in his divine human personality as essentially distinct from every other character in history. Sin is itself a violation of the normal order of things; and the entire divine activity against sin is contrary to all else that occurs or can occur. The incarnation of the Son of God is a great but necessary miracle—its reality attested by his triumphant resurrection from the dead. Such a being, and no other, can accomplish the greatest miracle of all, the forgiveness of our sins. History can afford no parallel. Forgiveness and the Incarnation belong together as parts in a higher cycle of events than those within the range of ordinary human experience.

And what was the peculiar content of Christ's message to the world? His call to repentance and godliness was not new, but had been voiced by all the prophets. His deeper exposition of the law had been foreshadowed in the Old Testament. His proclamation of the fatherhood of God was not new, though the paternal relationship was by him more vividly portrayed and more personally applied. He himself was the new element. His appearance wrought a wondrous change in the religious situation. The King was come. God was with men, though they knew him not. He came to offer, not abstract truth, but himself.

The miracles of Jesus were not, as with the prophets, exceptional manifestations. They accompanied his whole career and were performed by his own power. They were all miracles of mercy, in perfect keeping with his divine mission. They prepared men to believe in his power to forgive sins. We, who now receive this higher blessing of forgiveness, do not need the attesting minor miracles. We do not believe in Jesus because of his miracles, but we believe the miracles because of Jesus. And we believe that he who has thus manifested his power to help and save will come again, as he has foretold, in a way unknown to the records of history, to judge the world.

In the special redemptive work of Christ—his sufferings,

death, resurrection and ascension—we recognize the very central element of Christianity. Here he manifests his unvarying purpose not to condemn the world, but to save it. His life is a riddle to the disciples in its humility and his death leaves them hopelessly perplexed. But the resurrection makes all plain. He died for our sins, and is risen again for our justification. Ascending, he leaves with his followers the commission to preach to every creature repentance and forgiveness of sins in his name. Having accomplished his mediatorial work and shown himself superior to the limitations of the human life into which he entered that he might hallow and save it, he can now assure his disciples of his abiding, gracious presence on earth until the day when he shall be manifested the second time unto salvation. How absurd to seek in history a parallel to such a life, or to discredit it because it stands alone and unapproachable!

To summarize—Christianity, as a life, is fellowship with Jesus and through him with the Father. Its content is not certain propositions of abstract truth, but Christ himself, the crucified and risen Saviour, as the object of faith and worship. In him, a new and supernatural force entered the current of human life. Thenceforth "Christ and the World" must be the theme of all veritable history. The historians of the day may not acknowledge the new element. They have no sin, and therefore cannot understand the atonement. In their "religion" man forgives himself, and in their gospel Christ has no place, save as he taught men its principles. Yet the new force remains vital as in days of old, moulding and uplifting the lives of all who feel the awful stress of sin and, responding to the invitation of the living Saviour, find peace in believing in him. True Christianity has existed in unbroken continuity from the days of Christ. Beclouded in the Middle Ages, it was proclaimed anew by Luther after his deep personal experience of the power of the crucified and risen Son of God. It is Jesus, and he alone, who has made religion possible to us; for in him we have access to the Father and through his blood the forgiveness of our sins. A religion without the divine, everliving Redeemer is not Christianity.

## ARTICLE VII.

## EXPOSITION OF ROMANS, CHAP. 7 : 19.

BY REV. M. L. CULLER, A.M.

"For the good that I would I do not ; but the evil I would not, that I do."

This profound and comprehensive statement of the Apostle Paul, has been made the occasion of much unreasonable, and hurtful controversy in the Church of our blessed Lord.

The contention over this scripture arises in part from the fact, that there are some who do not really understand the purpose and meaning of the apostle ; but, I believe, the controversy exists in greater part, because there are some who pervert the text, as well as the greater part of the entire chapter, to support a theological or denominational dogma. It is certain St. Paul wrote the Epistle out of the depths of his own experience, as well as by inspiration of the Holy Spirit which enabled him to portray the experience of all men, in passing from the death of sin into newness of life in Christ Jesus. It must be remembered, that the apostle was addressing Christians, members of the church at Rome. He wrote to Christians, not unbelievers.

The question has been raised by commentators, and students of the text, and the context, whether the apostle intended to describe the state of the regenerate or the unregenerate.

(a) The Greek fathers, such as Origen, and Chrysostom in the Eastern Church, Pelagius in the Western Church, and even Augustine, before his controversy with Pelagius, Arminius, and some later exegetical writers, consider St. Paul's words, as descriptive of the experience of the unregenerate.

(b) Augustine, after his controversy with Pelagius, Jerome, Luther, Calvin and Beza, regard the apostle's teaching, as expressive of the experience of the regenerate.

(c) There is a third view which holds, that the verses of the chapter from 7th to 13th, describe the experience of the unre-

generate; and that verses from 14 to 25, describe the experience of the regenerate.

This view was held by Philippi, Delitzsch, the Scotch expositors, Dr. Hodge and later Calvinistic writers generally.

But I am persuaded, that Lutheran theology, and the consistent teachings of the Holy Scripture, and the analogy of our faith, compel us to reject the first, and last views, mentioned, and to hold the position, that the apostle intended to describe the state of the regenerate.

This will appear evident, I believe, from the following considerations and reasons :

1. The apostle was not describing a quiescent state of the soul, but the progress by which man is led by the law to Christ. The consideration which the text describes cannot exist in a soul that is not regenerated. For regeneration, in its widest sense in which it is generally used, expresses the state of the soul which has been brought to see its sin, and guilt, and reaches out the hand of faith for divine help. For the unregenerate are dead in sin, and have no true, or spiritual apprehension of the holiness of God's law, or the nature and guilt of sin.

Therefore said the apostle : "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned;" and, "You who were dead in trespasses and in sin, hath he quickened."

I fail to see how it can be denied, that the verses in the chapter from 7 to 24 describe the awakened sense of sin, and guilt in the regenerate, and an increasing need of divine grace, and help; and that verse 25 expresses the joyful experience of justification by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

But in verse 19, we have a summary statement of the evidence, that the battle between the renewed spirit, and the power of sin continues. In the verses following we see a clear, and manifest advance in the conflict with the old sinful nature, and also, that a more evident pleasure in God's law increases. There is also the humble confession in the regenerate, that though they know, and see their sins, and are at war with them, they are yet helpless without divine grace.



I feel sure this is the meaning of the apostle, when he wrote, "For the good that I would I do not ; but the evil I would not, that I do."

In other words, the apostle means to teach, that the awakened, or regenerate are quickened, and raised out of the death of sin with the earnest desire and purpose to do that which is good.

But they find, to their constant regret, the moral inability to do as they earnestly desire. They find evil ever present with them. They see and condemn and hate, and do not desire to do what is wrong or sinful, yet they have not always the moral ability to resist the evil. Our Saviour recognized this fact, when he said to the three most faithful disciples in Gethsemane, "The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak."

There is the clear confession in the previous verses, that the law is holy, just and good. This cannot be said of those who are not regenerated by the Word and Spirit of God.

The ego, the will, is in harmony with God's law, and will. But the moral ability to do is not equal to the moral perceptions and movements of the will. The flesh strives against the spirit, as said the apostle, "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these two are contrary, the one with the other."

It is only the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which can set the regenerate free—from the law of sin and death.

This the Apostle Paul found, in answer to his almost despairing cry "O wretched man that I am ; who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?" when he joyfully exclaimed, "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." It is indeed impossible to conceive how any but the regenerate, the believers, can have any true evangelical sense of sin, and guilt, and hatred of sin ; or a conviction that the law is holy and good, though it condemns the sinner. The unregenerate do not have a true sense of their sinfulness, and the justice and holiness of divine law. They seek to justify themselves, and to condemn the law of God and to blame God rather than themselves.

2. All through the Scriptures we find once and over again the most positive acknowledgment and confession of sinfulness

and the humble sense of failure on the part of the people of God.

The Psalms are burdened with the deep regrets of the penitent, the lamentation, that so often that which is good is not performed, and that which is forbidden, and condemned by the moral sense of the people of God, is yet followed. Indeed many of the Psalms seem to be sorrowful refrains of the passage of scripture under consideration : "For the good that I would I do not ; but the evil I would not, that I do."

Is not a large part of the prayers of the Church, in all her history, a sad confession of sins of commission and omission—a confession of failure to perform what the word of God enjoins, and what is the sincere desire of every regenerated soul to do ?

If the apostle, in the passage of Scripture we are considering, is not describing the experience, and condition of the regenerate, then we must, in a large measure, change the language in our Liturgies, and eliminate every expression of penitence and godly sorrow for sin in our prayers; and we must also reject many of our most precious hymns, which have done so much for centuries in nourishing the spiritual life of our Church.

I believe that a true understanding of the nature of regeneration will enable us to come to a true knowledge and exposition of the text.

Regeneration in its true, generic sense, is an act of God alone, the begetting of spiritual life in the soul of man. Regeneration is occupied with the production of faith. For the unregenerated have no true, saving faith. The Holy Spirit is the only power of disclosing to our minds, our sinful and depraved nature. As a bright beam of the sun, introduced into a room, shows millions of particles of dust everywhere, (but these particles were not placed there by the light, for they were there before, only there was not light enough to make them manifest) so the Holy Spirit, in a greater, and more glorious manner, produces in man's soul the knowledge and guilt of his sinful nature and sinfulness.

Regeneration is the birth of spiritual life.

It is the beginning and only the beginning of the new life of

God in us. This is the teaching of our Saviour, when he said : "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear;" and of the apostle Peter, when he wrote : "As new-born babes desire the sincere milk of the Word that ye may grow thereby." Also of the apostle to the Corinthians: "I have fed you with milk, and not with meat, for hitherto ye were not able to bear it."

These passages of Scripture speak of spiritual life in its beginning—of a being which is capable of receiving nourishment from the Word of God. This can be predicated only of such as are in a regenerated state.

Notice too what our Saviour said of the office of the Holy Spirit: "And when he is come, he will reprove, or convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and judgment to come."

These words plainly teach conviction of sin which is alone by the Holy Spirit. And speaking further of the Holy Spirit, Jesus said: "He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." In these words we see that the Holy Spirit creates faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. St. Paul said: "No man can say, that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."

Regeneration does not admit of degrees like sanctification, but is one act like natural birth. We are either born again, or we are not. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." It is illogical, and contrary to reason to think, or speak of any one having faith in Jesus Christ unto justification, who is not regenerated. We cannot think of men dead in trespasses and sin, as having any spiritual apprehension, any sense of sin, any saving faith in Jesus, any more than we can think of a dead body performing any of the function of a living body.

We must not confound justification with regeneration. Justification follows regeneration, and is the act of God by which He pardons all the sins of those who believe in the merits and sacrifice made by the Lord Jesus Christ, receives them into His favor, declares them righteous, acquits them from all guilt, re-

moves the curse of the law, turns away His wrath, and gives them a title to a blessed immortality.

(a) The means of regeneration are the Word of God, and the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, as it is written: "Born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by the Word of God"; and also: "But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared.

"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."

4. Our text for exposition, together with the context, has been perverted, by the advocates of sinless perfection, and instantaneous and complete sanctification, to support their unscriptural views.

(a) The perfectionists argue, that the language of the apostle is descriptive of the feelings of the unregenerate. Because they well know that this very scripture is the strongest possible condemnation of their unscriptural theory, they seek to pervert it, and claim, that the apostle has in mind those who are not the subjects of the renewing by the Holy Spirit. If the membership of the Church at Rome were not regenerated, believers and Christians, why would St. Paul call them "beloved of the Lord, called to be saints"?

(b) The advocates of instantaneous sanctification, while admitting, that the apostle is describing the spiritual conflict of the believer, yet contend, that verse 25 teaches instantaneous sanctification. But they very shrewdly quote only a part of this verse—"I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord," but willingly forget the other, and concluding part, "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin," which sweeps away the claim of instantaneous sanctification.

5. Failure to understand the true meaning of the apostle's teaching in the text, is caused also by a want of distinction between regeneration and sanctification. As already said, regeneration is an act alone of God, through the word and sacrament of Baptism and is not progressive. Just as nat-

ural birth is one act. But sanctification is progressive, and in its progress, the regenerated co-operate with God, by their strivings after holiness, and conformity to the will of God. They are renewed daily in the spirit of their minds. They strive to put off the old, and put on the new man. They bear the fruits of the Holy Spirit, as enumerated by the apostle in Gal. 5 : 22-23, as "Love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, etc." "Their path is as the shining light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day." "They lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset them, and run with patience the race which is set before them, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of their faith;" and as the apostle further says: "But we all with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

(a). Spiritual effort is never relaxed. St. Paul offers himself as an illustration of the strivings of the regenerated after sanctification. He said: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

6. But when we teach, as God's Word does, that man is "dead in trespasses and sins," and has no true knowledge of sin, or sense of guilt, or ability to believe unto salvation, we at the same time believe and teach, that man possesses all his rational powers, notwithstanding his depravity, and has the ability to give due attention to God's message to him, even as the apostle has written. When using the first creation by the Spirit of God as a type of the new creation in Christ, he said: "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

And God holds all men responsible for the use of their

natural powers in giving attention to his revealed will. They have no excuse for refusing to consider what God makes known to man.

7. There is this fact to be borne in mind, that if we have weak and indefinite conceptions of sin, our depravity and helplessness, we will then, of necessity, have very meagre, and imperfect conceptions of the person and glory and merits of our precious Saviour.

But we rejoice in the fact, that as the Lutheran Church, in all her teachings, has ever borne unmistakable evidence in her Confession of Faith of total depravity, she accordingly exalts Jesus Christ, as the center of the Christian faith, and magnifies the word of God and the Holy Sacraments. For as the best evidence of intelligence and intellectual progress is a confession of ignorance of much we do not know, so also a constant sense of sinfulness and many imperfections, is the best evidence of spiritual progress.

Only the ignorant can be conceited. Only the spiritually blind can have spiritual and Pharisaic conceit.

I believe we are justified in heartily believing and teaching that St. Paul in Rom. 7 : 19 and in the context, describes the conflict of the regenerated with the old sinful nature which still contends for mastery in the soul. As the Canaanites were still in the land of Canaan, and although they have been conquered by Israel, yet they were constantly rebelling and keeping the Israelites ever vigilant, and active to hold them in subjection, so also the regenerated—the children of God, partakers of the divine nature, are ever reminded by their imperfections and moral failures, that spiritual Canaanites yet dwell in their hearts and that they are never to lay off their armor, nor forget that they need divine grace and help, and may thus be ever inclined to walk humbly with God, doing justly, and loving mercy; with the apostle always led to confess, "When I am weak then am I strong;"—that "by the grace of God I am what I am;" and rejoicing with St. Paul, "that our lives are hid with Christ in God," and that, "when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory."

## ARTICLE VIII.

## WHAT RELATION DOES THE CHURCH BEAR TO THE WORLD?

BY REV. UPTON A. HANKEY, A. M.

There should be a distinctly drawn, and an easily definable, line of demarkation between the Church and the world. In these days of transmutations, and frequent departures from old accredited standards of belief, when Church History is rewritten, and the Holy Bible reconstructed in accordance with the notions of rationalistic Higher Criticism, things sacred change like the fashions, and are often regarded even with less respect.

The Church is the oldest—for church and family were synonymous in Eden—the one permanent institution in a changing world. It is in the world but not of it. In the Old and New Testaments we find frequent mention of bodies known as the Church, under such interesting titles as :

"The City of the Lord," "The Zion of the Holy One of Israel," "God's Heritage," "The Holy Hill," "A Peculiar People," "The Loved of God." We are told that God reigns in the Church, and commands the blessing of life ; that Jesus Christ is her Head and King ; and that in her is eternal salvation. There is not an accidental, but a real etymological affinity between the Hebrew *קְהִלָּה* and the Greek *καλῆν*, the *קְהִלָּה* of the Old Testament being rendered by *ἐκκλησία* in the New, which represents the Old Testament idea of "the congregation of the children of Israel." The Church is one, and continuous, in the Old and New Testaments, and signifies "the congregation of the saints," souls regenerated and under the controlling influences of God's Holy Spirit. In the Scriptures the term Church is never of course used in a narrow denominational or confessional sense, nor in reference to a building, but wholly in the sense of a body of believers, "the Holy Catholic Church," as designated in the Apostles' Creed, the one,



many-branched communion, consisting of all those who confess Jesus as Lord and Saviour.

In order to a clear understanding of the relation of the Church, in this sense, to the world, we must also call to mind the ends to be sought after in church organization and activity. The Church is here to finish the work the incarnate Christ came to begin. It exists for two cardinal purposes, viz.: gathering into its fold men from the world, for their salvation from sin and death, then training them in knowledge, love and faith of Christ. The mission of the Church is to save men, and then send them forth to save others.

The Church, as a spiritual organization, should be clearly separate and distinct from the world. This is clearly implied in the New Testament word *ἐκκλησία*, which is composed of two words, *ἐκ*, out of, and *καλεῖν*, to call, first used to designate an assembly of Greek citizens called together by a herald, for the transaction of business pertaining to the public welfare. The preposition, *ἐκ*, indicating that it was not a general crowd, a mere common mass meeting, but a gathering of free citizens possessed of certain legal rights and privileges; the verb *καλεῖν* indicating that the assembly was legally called for the purpose of deliberating on important matters. The full force of this compound word continues in its Biblical sense. The Church, as a congregation of believers, is "called out of darkness into His marvelous light," by a chosen herald or preacher of the Gospel of peace. They of the Church are the *κλητοὶ ἅγιοι*, "called to be saints" (Rom. 1: 7).

The Church is above the world and all other organizations. Organized societies having spiritual ends, the Sunday-school, and the Christian Endeavor, are not the Church; they may help, or hinder, as the case may be, the true Church. To the Church of Jesus Christ alone is entrusted the administration of the saving means of grace, by which she is distinguished from the world, and all other organizations. "The Church," says the Augsburg Confession, "is properly a congregation of saints and true believers." The Helvetic Confession says, "The Church is the assembly of the faithful, who have been called and collected from the world." The Westminster Confession

says, "The Church consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children ; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

When in Constantine's day the whole world came into the Church, there came in also all the vices of the world ; with much good soil added, there was gained also much that was barren and covered with weeds. There was the intrusion of heathen elements into the Christian Church ; an artificial syncretism of elements heathen and Christian. The line between the Church and the world, between those who were Christians in name and those who were Christians in heart was more or less obliterated. They overcame the Church, and the temporal gain of Christianity was in many respects cancelled by spiritual loss. The rightful position of Church and State is for each power to stand peacefully and independently side by side, so that their mutual influence may become a source of profit to both. We must ever guard against the secularization of the Church, which cannot fulfill its mission, if weakened and crippled by an intrusion of worldly elements.

The Church of Christ should always embrace the faithful followers of the Lord to the exclusion of hypocrites and wicked men, as far as possible. It must be an association, not of careless, indifferent people, but of those who are faithful and spiritual ; men and women of holy lives and princely purposes, who candidly affirm that they will "renounce the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh, so that they will not follow, nor be led by them." No body of people is worthy to be called a Church of Christ which is not composed of such members.

We need not be surprised that this is even the judgment of the world, and of unregenerate people. They look for a spiritual Church. The world has confidence in the Church only so far as it is composed of spiritually minded people, who are manifestly striving to live right in the sight of men and God. It is evident, if the members are deeply immersed in worldly cares and vanities, and are exhibiting merely "the form of god-

liness" without its fruits, such a body of so-called Christians can make no impression for good upon the world. It is too much like the world. It is in the world and also of it. We need a spiritual Church, and spiritual preaching—not the almost exclusive presentation of semi-secular themes—to influence the world at large, or the little section of it in which we live and operate; and only then are we indeed the Church of Christ. A study of the beginning, progress, life and victories of the early Church impresses us with its deeply spiritual tone, as well as with its simplicity and unity.

The Christian Church must illustrate before the world the Gospel spirit and life. The questions of the world with respect to the Church are: "What does the Church do?" "What is its value?" "Does it improve society and make men more happy, gentle, kind, charitable?" "Does it make men more trusted?" So far as the Church succeeds in exhibiting Christian life and deeds, in developing and confirming Christian character among its adherents, will it have an especial influence upon the world without.

What should be the attitude of the Christian Church towards the amusements of the world, is a vexed question. There are many really innocent amusements which the members of the Church sometimes use in a sort of apologetic fashion. No one will venture to draw the line; all shades of views prevail. What some regard innocent recreations others will stand aloof from in holy horror. Once a leading member of my church became greatly offended because the Sunday-school went on an excursion to an interesting place. He held the view that congregational and Sunday-school excursions, or picnics and even the innocent, old fashioned celebrations (where one could not do much harm even if so disposed) savored too much of worldly things, and should be religiously abstained from. When he was told that I could have partaken of the Lord's Supper the next day his hands went up in extreme astonishment. Had the brother been present at the wedding at Cana of Galilee he would undoubtedly have pronounced it a very worldly affair. There are some supersensitive Christians who believe that certain musical instruments and innocent games

are an invention of the devil. But some form of recreation is permissible to, yea, obligatory upon, a Christian, who owes a duty to the body as to the soul; in recognizing this he is sane and obedient. A walk even on the Lord's Day may be as good as a Sacrament. All recreations that refresh the mind and body, and give tone to nerve cells and fit them for endurance of work are right, whatever they are. We rejoice that generally the attitude of the Church is unequivocally friendly to many kinds of recreations.

However, the Church must not concede too much on this point. She must not descend to the world; here is often annulled the real good she has done; here the difference between the Church and the world is too often lost. The refined vices of civilization as theatres, balls, operas and debauchery, often creep in. Opera-going people are not generally church-going people, and dancing may cultivate fine attitudes of the body but, at the same time, it gives a disgraceful attitude to the soul. When you become a Christian church member are you asked to renounce the pleasures of the world? Yes; but you are not asked to give up any that are innocent; and should you wish to hold to those which are doubtful and sinful? No one really makes a sacrifice when he becomes a Christian, he makes an investment. It should not be forgotten that the Christian religion has the power to renovate and change the heart and life, so that one can renounce sinful pleasures, and substitute for them Christian joys and duties. So in relation to pleasures as to other matters, it may be said, "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life which now is, and of that which is to come." We love often to sing:

"Teach me some melodious measure,  
Sung by flaming tongues above;  
Fill my soul *with sacred pleasure*,  
While I sing redeeming love."

The Church which affords so many "sacred pleasures," which is in the world, yet not of it, will have the confidence and respect of the world, will be a winning church, will have many conversions, strangers will be attracted to its services, its finances will be good, and its missionary spirit aglow.

The Church, in relation to the world, is a preservative and corrective force. Christ said of His disciples "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil." The Church saves the world from ruin, and purifies with a new life and morality. It has somewhat the effect of Sapolio to remove dirt, vice and crime. If we could look into the practical, every-day workings of the Christian Church we should find it constantly correcting and adjusting the relations of people in society. Christ's teachings let in light and smite discovered evil. The Church as a moral force checks and corrects evils; as Dollinger says, "It is the great institution for educating mankind, and is to penetrate and purify, by its spirit, civil polity and right, marriage and morals, civilization and science, every form of moral life, every principle and product of national and individual life and activity." The ascended Lord has given to the Church the means of sanctification, holy laws, holy teaching. \* "Wickedness must either be prevented or cured; and if ever an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure, it is in this case. Let any man reflect, and try to estimate, if he can, what is the cost, directly and indirectly, of all the criminal prosecutions in the U. S., of all the drunkenness, and other crimes, and of property destroyed by fire and otherwise by the wickedness of men, and he will have some idea of the value of an institution which goes directly to prevent and restrain vice and crime, and indeed to root them out entirely." Now the Church is just such an institution.

The people of a community who are not members of any Church owe vastly much to the Church's life and activities in their midst, although they are generally too blind and prejudiced to admit it. The good they have and enjoy, their enlightened ideas, their peace, honesty, morality, even their prosperity, are benefits conferred largely by the Church's presence. Dr. Harkey also says: "Your own property in the community in which you reside. What is it worth? Your house and farm, whatever it may be? Have you ever inquired what gives it its

\* *The Character and Value of an Evangelical Ministry*, by Simeon W. Harkey, D.D.

present value? Or how much would your property be worth if situated in some heathen land, or destitute neighborhood where there are no Christian ministers and churches? Or suppose that all your houses of public worship were burned down or converted into theatres, the voice of every faithful minister of Christ among you hushed, and all the sanctifying influences and wholesome restraints of a preached Gospel removed; then tell how much would your property be worth? How long would your house be your castle, the peace and virtue of your family be secure, and you be permitted to lie down at night and sleep quietly, without any fear for your life and possessions? Why was property more valuable in Jerusalem in the days of David and Solomon than in those of the wicked Ahab? What shall we say of the people of Sodom, where Lot could not exercise the rights of hospitality to his angel guests, by reason of the surrounding depravity? What would you have given for Lot's house, if put up at auction, situated in the midst of such a community? And no doubt it was a good house—certainly a good man lived in it. But you reply that you have no property in Sodom, and that the argument is 'far-fetched.' But, how long would it take the place in which you live to become a Sodom, if all your faithful ministers and churches were removed? Not ten years. You see then that the argument is not so 'far-fetched.' It has a direct and most important home application."

Sweep away the educating, regenerating and uplifting influences of Christian churches, and the life and hopes they sustain, and what would keep men from sinking into despair and barbarism? The Church has been in the past, and is to-day, the great repository of intellectual and moral forces for the world. It stays the flood of corruption; rebukes the vices of the times; founds institutions of charity and public benefit; carries the Gospel into all the world, and undertakes to educate and train and civilize and Christianize peoples.

To say that the Christian Church exerts a preventive and corrective force in the world is true, but is not in itself sufficiently positive, as a statement of the Church's errand and purpose in the world.

Then, further, the salvation of the world from sin and death is the supreme object for which the Church was called into being, and now exists. The mission of the Church of our Lord is the same as the mission of Christ, who said to His disciples, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you." The errand of Christ was to save; this is the Church's errand. It is here to finish the work the incarnate Christ came to begin.

Ordinarily there can be no salvation out of the Christian Church. Philosophy and science cannot usurp the Church's place. Take away the Church and you take away the Gospel; take away the Gospel, and there remains no hope of peace and life. The phrase, "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus," which our Church accepts, means that to be certain of salvation one must belong to "the congregation of the saints." We often hear the current expression, "the Church cannot save you," but it is really a tacit expression of dislike for, and indifference to, the Christian Church. Where the Gospel is preached, the sacraments administered, repentance and faith exercised, even if in the open, there is a church, souls are won, and Christ saves.

Rev. J. G. Morris, D.D., in his lecture on the Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, says: "The peculiar and appropriate benefits of the Church, such as regeneration, conversion, etc., are not to be obtained outside of the Church, therefore, there is no salvation out of the Church." She is here to point out the way of life, and persuade men to walk in that way. She is here to save the world, this is her business. The true Church and Christ are so identical that you cannot separate them and say, "Here is Christ, there is the Church."

The question arises, is the Church diligently pursuing her main business? Rev. Henry Van Dyke, D.D., in the *Homiletic Review*, (November 1893) pertinently puts it thus: "If Christ were to come to your church to-day in personal presence, what, think you, would be the first question He would ask? 'What is the form of your church government? What is your theological system? Do you sprinkle, or immerse? How many have you added to *this* church?' What man or woman or child believes that the Lord Jesus Christ would ask one of these or similar questions? He *would* ask: 'Where



are your poor? How have you cared for your sick, and needy, and ignorant, and unhappy? Have you cared for your orphans, and sought homes and friends for your homeless and friendless? How many sinners have you brought to the knowledge of Christ?" The message of Jesus Christ to John in Machærus means just this: "What Jesus did for the needy of his day, the Church of Jesus Christ must do for the needy of our day."

The Church of the present reaches out toward man in many ways, and is broader in her sphere of activity than formerly. In her missionary efforts, home and foreign, she seeks to convert and save the world; in her educational service she has done, and is now doing, a great work, and in the coming years this department of her work will be carried on commensurate with her widening opportunities and growing wealth.

Also in recent years her activities along social lines have been marked. The Church has applied herself to the improvement of social conditions, and has welcomed every wise attempt to construct the social order upon a better basis than the present. It strives to show labor its dignity and duties, and capital its responsibilities. It aims to prove itself a friend to every man whom it can help to nobler life and make more worthy of Christian privileges. Prof. Swing, in *The Forum*, (Sept. 1892) says: "The Church has slowly added to the work of the salvation of the soul the task of making the rescue assume the preliminary form of salvation from ignorance, vice and poverty. The older Church worked to remove or obviate a special misery called by the many names of "Hell," "Eternal pain," or "banishment;" but the later logic asks the sanctuary to consider all misery as near akin, and to connect the mind which suffers in this life, with the mind which may suffer beyond the tomb. Ignorance, vice, poverty, injustice are viewed as calamities, and must be treated as a part of that deep shadow which in its blackest form makes up a 'lost soul.'" The Christian Church is rightly looking toward, and must look toward, the complete interest of man as a mind, a body, a soul. The Church should cultivate all the worthy concerns and interests of man, and take that large, scriptural view of religion which

includes the body as well as the soul, and all worthy human affairs as well as heaven. She must teach the ideas of brotherhood, love, truth and justice, and emphasize more the much neglected command: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." She must not only, in a transport of emotion, sing:

"Blest be the tie that binds,—"

but also seek to break some of the ungodly ties which bind men and corporations of men in the dreadful chains of covetousness, greed and selfishness, and bring in the time when,

"All men's good shall be each man's rule,  
And universal peace lie like  
A shaft of light across the land,  
And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,  
Thro' all the circle of the golden year."

In the very effort to bring the Church's life in contact with the practical life of men has come the Institutional Church. And why not wisely so? As Tennyson makes King Arthur say,

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,  
And God fulfills himself in many ways,  
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

The essential features only of the Church are divine, the methods are variable and human, and should be made to answer existing conditions, contingencies and problems. That we are in a new era of church activity is apparent. In many places, instead of providing only or alone for the public preaching and teaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments, the ministrations of the Church have greatly broadened by annexing various departments for carrying out the principles of the Gospel in rescue and relief work, for the masses, in making the body comfortable as well as the soul.

This is legitimate. David Livingstone, in writing to some one who thought there was too much "geography" and not enough "grace," in his work, said: "My views of what is *missionary* are not so contracted as those whose ideal is a dumpy sort of man with a Bible under his arm. I am serving Christ

when shooting a buffalo for my men, or taking an astronomical observation, or writing to one of His children."

Let the Church in her broadening activities minister to the whole man; let it care for the soul. This is "applied Christianity." The Church is only a means to an end; she exists for the sake of the salvation of the world. Her annexes are numerous and comprise such additions as young people's societies, libraries, reading-rooms, literary circles, Bible schools, kindergartens, boys' brigades, hospitals, employment and beneficiary associations, and many others which reveal a widening and powerful Church.

The Christian Church to-day is the most elastic, practical, beneficial institution in the world. Through its blessed instrumentality shall be brought in the day, when, "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." The expression upon the lips of Francis Xavier, in his zealous missionary labors in East India, where he won hundreds and thousands, was: "Amplius! Amplius!" being constantly moved by his zeal toward larger conquests. So with the activities and life of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, let us say, "Amplius!" "Amplius!"

## ARTICLE VIII.

## MINISTERIAL EDUCATION IN THE MARYLAND SYNOD.

BY REV. CHARLES REINWALD, A.M.

One of the most effective and eloquent pleas ever offered on the floor of any synod was presented some years ago in behalf of our Loysville Orphan's Home, by a brother, now a member of the Maryland Synod. Among other allusions, he referred to a pack of pathetic letters, representing the accumulation of well nigh a year. He resolved to devote one entire week to the careful reading and study of these epistles of entreaty and distress. That week's time was well spent. The words of that visiting brother in an adjoining synod won a warm response and have been feelingly referred to not a few times since, by both layman and minister.

They witnessed a seed-sowing whose harvest the subsequent years shall continue to gather in. It means bread for the hungry and a loving ministry for the homeless.

If we will but take a deeper and profounder look we shall behold another scene that is too imperative to be studied with indifference. The pioneer fathers of our Church were distressed with the spiritual orphanage during the early and later decades of the past century. Earnest appeals went up for shepherds to feed the flock and break the bread of life to the perishing. Out of meager resources a Theological Seminary and College, both at Gettysburg, were established to provide an adequately trained Gospel Ministry. Few candidates blessed with sufficient means for entire self-support were available. The out-look was perplexing and the future seemed ominous and dark. The record of the early days teaches us anew how strength is born of struggle. Their faith and consecration were founded on the assurance that when God's word directs to a promised land, he is pledged to provide a way into its posses-

sion. Reason and Scripture both pointed to the potent plan of sharing the work and burden of ministerial preparation.

Hence Beneficiary Education began its history in answer to the divine command "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature."

Without disregard of duty in the present, or toward the claims of Ministerial Education in the future let us first take a swift survey of the years through which this history has moved.

Our territory was once the field of Foreign Mission service. The earliest religious teachers that served our people were trained in the schools beyond the sea. We owe a debt to a foreign land—rather to our Fatherland.

Can we thoroughly appreciate the deep anxiety and solicitude of the pioneer Lutheran ministers of our historic churches, upon the very territory that is now ours to cultivate and care for?

May I for a moment quote from a much prized document now in possession of the Lutheran Historical Society, Mt. Airy Philadelphia? It is a letter written by one of the earliest pastors of the venerable St. John's Church, Hagerstown, Md. The writer is Rev. John George Young, and the communication is addressed to Dr. Helmuth of Philadelphia. One consideration in it serves to fix the authentic date of the beginning of Lutheranism in Emmitsburg in 1757, when pulpit service came at intervals of eight and twelve weeks. Rev. Young at a distance of thirty-five miles from Hagerstown served that congregation for a period of about two years. A similar reference is made to the old Central Monocacy Church, near Creagerstown, sixteen miles from Frederick and twenty-two from Hagerstown.

In 1771—viz. 131 years ago—the pastor of St. John's served both these congregations, when the dearth of ministers was so great that one man had about one-third of the Maryland Synod territory for a single parish. At the conclusion of his letter filled with a sense of great care of the congregations he was shepherding, he says: "Such, dear doctor, are the congregations I have, therefore, served with fear and trembling and weakness."

"May God graciously grant his blessing upon my weak planting and watering. How humble I often am," he continues, "as often I cannot see the hoped for fruit—and tares instead of the true grain appear. The Lord have mercy upon his vineyard especially upon that portion of it in our own America in order that the wild boar may not do greater damage." This prayer becomes the more significant and memorable when we now recall that in the course of half a century following in the same St. John's of Hagerstown, Oct., 24, 1820, the General Synod of the Lutheran Church was organized. Examine the earliest records of our Church's life and service and you find the emphasis is laid on education of men for the Christian Ministry. Education received, as it deserves to receive, the largest and most liberal contributions.

The establishment of our institutions at Gettysburg witnessed the earliest attention of our Church, as such, to the cause of beneficiary education.

"In this good work as in most others," says a writer in the *Evangelical Review* for Oct., 1852, "we find the Synod of Maryland taking the initiative." As far back as 1831 and earlier in her history we find this Synod active in her offerings for missions and education and her zeal in this cause has been continually on the increase. No formal action was had by the Church until the meeting of the General Synod in the year 1835. During that convention was organized the Parent Education Society of the Lutheran Church.

It was soon discovered that there was too much organization. Accordingly two years later at the meeting of the General Synod at Hagerstown the defects were remedied and a working constitution adopted.

During the first two years ending with October, 1837, the number of students aided by the Parent Education Society was 41. The fund expended \$4,449.00.

In 1839 the number of students was 53—the receipts \$6,722. It may be interesting to state that the West Penn. Synod was the largest contributor, a pre-eminence which belongs to that Synod through subsequent years.

The Synod of Maryland and Virginia gave that biennium \$1,847.

In 1841 the number of students was 47, the receipts \$6,810.

In 1843 the number of students for the ministry assisted in different institutions was 57. The receipts \$5,911.00, a decrease of nearly \$1,000. This deficiency is in part explained by interest in missionary efforts which now began to awaken concern.

In 1845 the number of students helped was 44. The receipts were \$6,187.

The next record is 1848 when there were only 17 students aided, including Gettysburg, Hartwick and Wittenberg.

At this period the society was summoned to sustain itself against rude assaults from without and within. It was emphatically the dark night of her history. The halls of the Theological Seminary half a century ago were well nigh empty as a consequence.

In the convention of the Maryland Synod in 1851 Dr. H. L. Baugher, Senior, presented the following statement which embodies the judgment of his mature and brilliant mind.

He says: "A careful examination of the history of the ministry of our Church will show that since the existence of Penn. College more than one-half of our ministers have been aided by the Church in their preparation. This shows the importance of the subject to the welfare of our Church. Too much care cannot be exercised in the selection of persons to whom aid is extended. Mistakes will occur under the most careful supervision, for we are not only deceived in others, but our own hearts deceive us.

"The millions of heathen dying without the knowledge of Christ and the ministerial destitution of our own country and Church press upon our attention and action the claims of the whole Church.

"Resolved that this synod pledge to raise the sum of \$2,000. for education during the coming year."

In that year there were thirty-two pastorates. In 1901, 50 years later, seventy-five pastorates with an enlarged membership, scarcely give the cause as generous support. One year



later—in 1852 the report on education by the same masterful and consecrated Doctor Baugher says: "This report is one of the most important, perhaps the most important, which claims the attention of the Church. Education makes the man and therefore makes the Church. The human mind from its nature will be educated. During that year 34 students were supported by the Parent Education Society.

"If you will grant me your further indulgence let me invite your attention to a certain synodical action that antedates even the period of half a century ago—viz., 1848—the storm period of the Parent Education Society.

"Resolved, That it is the appropriate business of the synod [*i. e.*, the Maryland] to make provision for the education and sending forth of an able and faithful ministry.

"Resolved, That hereafter the subject of beneficiary education and Home and Foreign Missions be introduced into the annual proceedings of this body as a part of our regular synodical business.

"Resolved, That three brethren with alternates be appointed to make addresses at our next annual meeting."

The appointee for the address on Ministerial Education was the Rev. David F. Bittle and the place of its delivery was St. John's, Hagerstown.

Without any perceptible break or synodical apathy to the consideration of this important work of the Church, it appeals to us now and to all our people. For it is to be feared that there are antagonists, as well as apologists and eulogists, even when so noble a service as Ministerial Education modestly asks for a continued and brighter history in the future.

For one week I almost literally lived among the old pamphlets and minutes that report the proceedings of the earlier life of the Lutheran Church on the territory of the Maryland Synod. The members of that body have nearly all passed from the Church Militant, to their reward on high.

But it is for any man a profitable task and pleasure as well, to read and ponder the record that witnesses their sincerity,

earnestness and enthusiasm in the great cause of providing an able and adequate ministry.

In 1849, Dr. Benj. Kurtz embodies this passage in his report.

"The Parent Education Society is now aiding about thirty students, though we must all admit the wants of the Church call for more than triple that number and that her pecuniary ability is more than sufficient to furnish the requisite means of support."

Just half a century ago the President of Pennsylvania College wrote:

"The Parent Education Society up to this date 1852, has been instrumental in assisting into the Ministry about 120 men, most of whom are now actively engaged in their Master's work. This is about one-eighth or a fraction more of our present ministry."

If such results have been produced by incipient action of the society under the pressure of embarrassments of various kinds, what may we anticipate when the Church with cordial co-operation will lay hold of this subject with hearty good will, and carry it forward with the energy which she is capable of exerting?

From 1854 to 1870 the average number of men aided in preparing for the ministry was 7 per year. The funds expended during those 16 years was \$11,312.35.

From 1870 to 1880, the average number of students per annum was 10½, and the amount disbursed was \$16,244.01.

In the year 1871 the synod contributed \$300 more for education than last year, 1901—just thirty years later. The number of students aided was the same as this present year, 1902—viz. 11.

In the decade from 1870 to 1880—the year 1871 furnished the largest contribution for education reaching the sum of \$2,486.60. In the same decade the largest number of students in any single year was in 1874, when the number assisted was 15.

In the next decade from 1880 to 1890, the average number

of students under the care of the Synod was 13; the aggregate disbursements \$18,041.99.

The year of this period which furnished the most funds was 1882, when \$1,999.20 was the amount.

In the final decade of the XIXth Century the Maryland Synod assisted, within the fraction of a tenth, an average of 16 students per year, at an outlay of \$21,777.40.

In 1893 was the banner year for education—though it was a year of financial stringency. During that year the Maryland Synod contributed \$2,635.00, and aided 20 students for the ministry.

In the year 1900 the Synod had 13 students and expended \$1,600.00.

In 1901, 11 students were supported to the extent of \$1575.

In 1902, there were 11 students, and the amount disbursed \$1,502.25.

The aggregate amount disbursed by the Synod's Education Committee in the past half century reaches the total of \$71,052.70.

It must be remembered, however, that this summary must be received with an explanation.

During these years sums of money were appropriated which have been either in part or as a whole refunded by grateful beneficiaries to the Education Committee. These amounts appear therefore several times in the Grand Total.

It is also deserving of mention that in answer to urgent appeals from the brethren in the South, the Synod through its Education Committee aided quite a number of Ministerial students in Roanoke College, Virginia. These amounts do not appear in the aggregate, \$71,000, for Ministerial Education during half a century.

However imperfect has been my endeavor to present this important subject, we gain no small degree of satisfaction in surveying the record of these years. The workmen, whom the meager contributions of the whole Church assisted, are the warrant of the system's worth. Their work challenges examination. Those who are in search of a pretext for not sustain-

ing this branch of beneficence will point out the spots on the sun. Their's however will be the indulgence of a petty and pitiful performance. Our Church is capable of doing better service with her talent and her means than she has ever done before. All honor then to the men and women whose prayers and purses, like Madam Cotta who four centuries ago befriended the German miner's son, have aided by a timely offering, indigent young men, oppressed with the conviction "Wo is unto me if I preach not the Gospel."

Should it be true as surmised, and whispered—yea openly asserted, that Ministerial Education is on the wane—that few men are in the college classes to-day, with the Gospel Ministry in view, it indicates results, it seems to me, of the hollowness and insincerity of pretenders in the pew honeycombed with worldliness—and the heartless response to our Divine Lord's command. "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into his harvest."

When a few years ago there was a probability of the frowning of foreign guns upon our shores, \$50,000,000 were quickly voted without a dissenting voice in our National Congress.

The act was universally applauded. There was preparation and equipment of armor for attack and defence on both land and sea. Is the demand for Ministerial equipment and qualification less imperative? Is there not another and more perilous foe that our generation is facing? Are we even caring for the children of our own household of faith?

Would any Christian be so disloyal as to disregard the privilege of sharing the grace of giving, in providing the appropriation for the worthy preparation of indigent and consecrated young men to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ to a sinful and sighing world—yea to come to the help of the Lord—"to the help of the Lord against the mighty?"

The record of an earlier day calls upon us not to remove the old land-marks. Whenever the management and administration of any department of human activity, either within or without the pale of the Church, is flawlessly perfect—then we

may all rightly look, and not till then—for infallibility in the affairs of Ministerial Education. In the noon-tide of that still far-distant day will the last and best word be spoken on this important but controverted subject.

---

ARTICLE X.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

By REV. M. COOVER, A.M.

Why did the captain of the Lord's host command Joshua to remove his shoes on the sacred spot of casual conference at Jericho? Why did Moses take off his shoes in God's presence at the Burning Bush?

Dr. W. Robertson Smith in *The Religion of the Semites* says that wearing clothes in the presence of holy persons and in sacred places made them taboo for common use. Garments became sacred by association with things sacred. The best dress was holy dress, perfumed and worn only on sacred occasions. Gala dress and holy dress were one and the same. Common clothes coming into contact with what was holy made them taboo.

To be made serviceable for common wear they must be washed to be dispossessed of their sacred character. But shoes could not well be washed. To wear common shoes into the presence of the divine made them sacred and serviceable only on sacred occasions.

Mr. W. R. Paton in *The Classical Review* for July gives another explanation. Mr. Paton says shoes were not made sacred by contact with holy things, but were too unsacred for approach to what was divine because made of skins of animals. Im-

purity attaches to everything that is dead. The skin of dead animals worn as shoes carried defilement.

Dr. Smith's explanation, however, has for its support significant religious customs among ancient peoples. The Jewish priests serving the Lord in sacred functions not only bathed themselves and their garments in preparation for holy exercises, but also washed themselves and their robes after their sacred duties were performed.

The earthen vessels used in seething the animal sacrifices were not capable of being thoroughly cleansed after use since the pores of the metal became filled with the percolating liquid. Hence the vessels were broken and destroyed so as not to be employed for common purposes.

The rabbis washed their hands after handling the parchments of sacred Scripture not because the parchments were made of the skins of beasts, but because their hands coming into contact with what was holy became taboo, defiled for the handling of common things. Care was taken to have none but the skins of clean beasts prepared for parchments that scribes might not defile the word from the mouth of the Lord.

---

"It is his angel," said the prayer-meeting company in Mary's house to little Rhoda when she announced that Peter was knocking at the gate. Did they think it was Peter's ghost? "It is a spirit" the disciples whispered, and cried out in fear when they saw Jesus walking on the sea. Here, however, they did not say it was Peter's spirit, but his angel. What did they mean? They meant his guardian angel, commentators say, a spiritual attendant commissioned to accompany him and guard his welfare. Such angels were appointed according to Jewish belief to watch over men, and every person had his individual guardian angel. Little children were especially cared for by these ministering spirits. "In heaven their angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven," said Jesus. But where did the idea of a guardian angel originate? After all is the conception scriptural?

Olshausen gave the angel a Platonic meaning. He said it

was the archetype or ideal of man laid up with God in heaven. God looks on man not solely as a miserable and sinful being, but as well on what he is planned to be. God sees his ideal. To that ideal man is to correspond. By it he is kept in touch with spiritual things and continued in the consciousness of the divine. Each person's guardian angel is his archetype, his ideal personality according to the measure of a man, that is, of an angel.

Dr. J. H. Moulton in *The Journal of Theological Studies* for July presents a different origin of the idea. In the Bible two classes of angels are mentioned. The one we know well as the ministering spirit sent of God to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation.

The other we do not know so well because its nature is not so clearly defined. Mention is first made of the second kind of angel in the Book of Daniel. There the angel appears as "prince," such as prince of Persia, prince of Greece, and also as Michael, the prince of the house of Israel. This prince or angel is the impersonator of nations, a representative and not a ministering spirit, or guardian angel.

In the Apocalypse of John it is the "angel" of the Churches that bears before God as representative the moral and spiritual condition of the ecclesiastical organizations. They do not minister, nor are they sent from God, but rather stand before him as impersonators of religious conditions. The angels who in heaven behold the face of the Father are not keeping guard over children. They do not encamp round about them, but stand before God as their representatives. Peter's angel could not be his guardian while knocking at the gate, if Peter were in distress; and if Peter were dead, the earthly ministry of a guardian angel had ceased. Dr. Moulton advocates a Persian origin for the Jewish idea of man's angel. The Zoroastrian *fravashi* corresponds to this representative spirit. According to later Parsism man's being is divided into soul, body, life, form and *fravashi*. At death the soul unites with the *fravashi* and becomes immortal. The *fravashi* of man is always in the presence of Ahura. It is the part of his personality that is



hidden with God. From this Parsis conception the Jews derived their idea of each man's individual angel.

In *The Sunday School Times* for September 6th Canon Tristram gives some circumstantial evidence for the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. In Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14 are lists of clean and unclean animals classified in similar forms. Deuteronomy, however, contains in its list nine animals not mentioned in Leviticus. A careful examination of the natural history of the country and of the philological history of the names of these animals shows that these beasts, with but one exception, are denizens of the desert plains, or of bare rocky heights. They never were inhabitants of the land of Goshen, nor of any part of the delta of the Nile, nor of the land of Palestine except its most southern wilderness portion. Why are these beasts, the antelopes and desert animals, not mentioned in Leviticus? Because the Levitical legislation was given at Mt. Sinai when the Israelites had been out of Egypt but a few months, and had not yet experienced their long wilderness pilgrimage, nor come to know the animals of the desert.

Familiarity with the desert haunts and rocky heights, the localities where these animals were indigenous, gave to the lawgiver this inclusive list written in the Deuteronomic legislation at the end of the forty years' wanderings. Strong circumstantial evidence is here furnished of Mosaic authorship. But why might not this list in Deuteronomy have been prepared by Hilkiah in the days of king Josiah when the law was discovered, or as some suppose, invented and imposed on the king? Might it not have had an exilic or post-exilic origin at the hands of Jeremiah, or Ezra? Did they not have knowledge of the deserts and mountains where these animals were native?

The Jews of that period were not explorers, or travelers in those regions where these animals were solely indigenous. Their journeys were either to Egypt or to Assyria, and on neither of these routes did they travel the southern desert or meet with the desert animals. The way to Egypt lay through Gaza and Zoar, districts fertile and cultivated. The journey to Babylon was through fruitful Mesopotamia and the fertile valley

of the Tigris. Jeremiah's haunts furnished no knowledge of these animals, nor did Ezra's journey supply any experiences adequate for the composition of the Deuteronomic list. Hilkiah was a provincial priest; no Arabic traveler, no student of the natural history of animals in an alien desert. The list could have been compiled only in the period when it purports its composition. The vivid experiences of the desert journey, and the entrance to Canaan on the east of Jordan, alone can furnish the touches of local coloring, and the accuracy of the historic conditions.

---

Some circumstantial evidences for the truth of New Testament miracles are given by Dr. Sanday in *The Expository Times* for November.

Dr. Sanday first goes outside of the Gospels and takes the Epistles of Paul as the source of evidence. What conception did logically minded Paul have of miracles, and what claim did he make in respect of miraculous power? On occasions when it was no part of an argument to produce belief in miracles, when reference to them was incidental and not didactic, he refers to miracles as well authenticated signs wrought by himself and other Christian disciples. He could appeal to miracles without being challenged, claiming the power to work them, and assuming the possession of the same power by others. Dr. Sanday cites the following: "For I will not dare to speak of any things save those which Christ wrought through me, for the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, *in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Ghost.*" (Rom. 15 : 18, 19. "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, *by signs and wonders and mighty works*" (2 Cor. 12 : 12). "For to one is given through the Spirit \* \* \* *gifts of healings, in the one Spirit; and to another workings of miracles* (1 Cor. 12 : 8-10).

"He therefore that *supplieth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you*" (Gal. 3 : 5). There is no doubt as to Paul's belief in miracles. Dr. Sanday then turns to the Gospels. There our Lord furnishes evidence of the fact of miracles in his self-witness. The keynote of the temptation in the

wilderness is the pressure brought to bear on Jesus to work miracles for purposes other than altruistic.

The force of the temptation rests on the capability to do the miraculous. Now no one could have invented such an experience of Jesus with its unique ethical test, for no one had such an insight into the meaning of Christ's mission. It must have come from Jesus himself, and from none other. This incident furnishes very stringent evidence from our Lord's self-witness. There is no doubt that Jesus and his disciples wrought miracles, or signs which they thought to be miracles. But does it follow, Dr. Sanday asks, that what were thought to be miracles then would be regarded strictly as miracles now? It is beyond doubt that phenomena occurred in the first century of our era which with common consent were deemed miraculous. But in how strict a sense were they miraculous? Would we call them miracles now? May they not have been so constituted as to show a double aspect, one to the contemporaries of Jesus, and another to us in our recognition of the rigid order of natural law? May not the operation of some cause deemed by the ancients miraculous be a cause explainable now on natural grounds? The power of human personality and will, psychological and telepathic influences effective in changing the feeling and will of others, would be regarded as miraculous by the contemporaries of Jesus. A higher personality and will than ours would surpass the power of imperfect will and transcend the limitations set to our capabilities. A personality filled with the Spirit of God would doubtless exercise a wondrously reorganizing power over men in weak and diseased conditions of body and mind. It might explain some miracles, but not all. Dr. Sanday concedes that such explanations should be used with reserve and caution. There is an element of truth in this method of reasoning, and an element of danger. We may evaporate the fact by a superficial explanation of the nature of the fact. The conviction of truth may remain firm though the traditional method of explaining it undergo change. But a unique personality surpassing natural origins, and unexplainable by natural causes and human ethical development, cannot be confined to the limita-

tions set by common though scientific human experience. The claim to fathom miracle by natural causes assumes the capability to clear away what is unique and superhuman in Christ. The fact that some miracles require a less degree of exceptional power than others for their effecting does not minimize the power necessary to work such momentous miracles as are incapable of explanation by natural causes.

---

The Editor of *The Independent* has not escaped the danger of wholesale naturalism in his treatment of miracles in an editorial on *The Recession of Miracle* in the issue of Dec. 4th.

The strenuousness of the rule of law, a law so rigid as to deny the fact of free will, endangers, if it does not annihilate, faith in miracles. A setting aside of this strenuous law by the intrusion of miracle, a suspension of inviolable order, is thought to be impossible. The necessary orderliness of the universe makes miracle more a hindrance than a help to faith. But whence comes this observable order? Is law a power resident in matter, or only a name given to the orderliness which we observe in the flow of phenomena? We do not see compulsion in nature, but possessing reason we are lifted above nature to see our mind's order reflected in the world of material facts and forces. If our intelligence were sufficiently comprehensive we might see miracle to be an expression of law. The great effort of man to maintain his possible moral personality and its purposes against the pressure of nature implies the existence of freedom from absolutely irrefragable law. The fact that moral principles do regulate material activities among men shows that man is not a creature fixedly subject to irreversible law. The strenuous bonds of material necessity are strained and broken under the force of man's moral freedom. Man can make nature bend. Is man the highest moral personality? Is God so immanent in law that he is not free? The fountain of redemptive and morally constructive forces does not flow along a channel of inflexible adamant law. It cuts its way and wears through customs of motion and trends of energy and makes new channels for itself to effect spiritual products. The editor of *The Independent* does not entirely yield miracle, but

he does yield the citadel of defence without using a piece of artillery which is at least an efficient cryptic means of resistance. The din of battle is all about material phenomena and their irrefragable laws. But the source of the conception of law, the human mind itself, is overlooked. A theory of knowledge has something vital to do with the subject of miracles. When we come better to know what man himself is, and what his mind or understanding, from which his conceptions of law arise, another aspect of the relation of God to nature will be capable of being seen. There is a growing pretentious superiority of religious criticism today which regards the believer in miracles as lacking intellectual sanity. But it is a superficial criticism which takes account only of the phenomena of matter and attendant observable order called law, and overlooks superciliously the phenomena of mind. What is the real ground of certainty, matter or mind? How is any truth apprehended save by a mental process? Why does man think, and not the stone or tree? Why does man exercise reflection, and not the oyster? What is the transition from the merely sensitive to the reflective reasoning consciousness? The emotional and volitional factors in the grasping of truth are not to be overlooked, yet at the risk of being more than commonly frivolous I may say that man without mind could not know either God or the facts of religion. The mind is not creative of facts, but regulative of them by its very nature. For anything to be known it must be in relation to a conscious mind. An interpretation of the nature of thought itself, a theory of mind and of knowledge, has something serious to do with the interpretation of life and religion. The metaphysics of religion or theology may be but slightly appreciated, or even tabooed by the practical school of defenders of the faith, but the character of apologetics daily becoming more imperative makes absolutely necessary the inferential proof drawn from metaphysical deductions.

The question was asked, what is the true ground of certainty, mind or matter? Neither separately, but both in unity. Perceptions furnished by the manifold of material phenomena through sensibility must be met in man by conceptions sup-

plied by the principle for the organization of experience. A spiritual principle must bridge the chasm between the perceptions of objects and the conceptions of the conscious subject. The factors of the understanding, the tools of the ideas of reason, are perception and conception. The inferences subjectively attained and those objectively presented in the history of Christ and Christianity, must be combined to reach religious truth. Religion is not to be evolved from human reason, but circumstantial evidence of very credible nature may come along intellectualistic lines for the substantiation of both reason and the facts of miracle and revelation.

Speculative theism is not creative of religious facts, nor can miracle and revelation be always reduced to terms of reason. Moral intuition, and the heroic faith of triumphant certainty bring their evidence to bear on religious verities. There is that unconquerable self-certainty which confronts the most irrefragable dialectic.

While the subjective reflections, however, of human reason do not create religious facts for faith, yet they do furnish very authoritative inferential proofs of their verity. To the mind not accustomed to think along these lines the inferences may not be very cogent. But the mind that tries to fathom why it thinks at all, must confront material things with subjective reflections. The answer to the how and why of thought itself throws light on the assumption of irrefragable natural law. Disbelievers in miracle are cryptically, and sometimes unconsciously, disciples of rigid naturalism, a naturalism which to be consistent must rule out of court every thing that is not materialistic. Man is deemed but one link in the one great chain of necessary cause and effect, and his entire being with all its phenomena can be accounted for by the laws of matter and motion. Thought is a mere physiological function, and all moral principles are mere adjustments advantageously arranged for utility. Everything is embraced in an order of necessity. But even Hume said, "Necessity is something that exists in the mind, not in objects."

The editor of *The Independent* thinks that should faith in miracle go we would still retain all that is vital in Christianity. The belief in the supernatural birth, or the bodily resurrection

of Jesus, is not ethical or spiritual, he says. It has nothing to do with character. Vital elements of Christianity are such as the Sermon on the Mount, the doctrines of love and regeneration. Miracle concerns only theology, and not life. But does an error of fact or history in no way affect the facts of life and doctrine? If the miracles be not true can the teaching of Jesus be honestly extricated from its occasions and environments? A moral question will obtrude itself and demand an answer. Jesus bore self witness to miracles. Was Jesus himself deceived, or by accommodation to prevalent ideas did he suffer himself to deceive others? If Jesus acted either way he subjects himself to moral criticism. His own ethical spirit is at stake, and his qualifications to teach are invalidated. If the whole error lies with the reporters of Jesus who imposed on him and his teaching things he did not do and words he did not say, we have no Christ of history.

Not only miracle, but morality is evaporated. If Jesus were born as common man, and held in death as man is held, and did nothing supernatural, he possessed a character explainable on natural grounds, and, as Harnack says, was closer to God than other men only through his ethical keenness and spiritual susceptibility. We are then down on the level of naturalism, and the ethical implicates of the Gospels bear but a blurred stamp. The gospel history is but a chronicle of legendary traditions. We do not have a factual Christ, but an eclectic interpretation of Christ. The authority of Christianity is not in Christ after all, but in an interpretation of him.

The gospel is a perishable source, not durable in the light of criticism. Its preconceptions are traditional, and not historic, the outcome of the ecstatic glorification of Messianic dreams. The record rests not on facts, but on a faulty interpretation of facts, the absolute truth of which is now undiscoverable, and the statements of which are usable only by careful postulates. The New Testament writings are simply but a religious treatise of human construction, a pious disquisition to be sifted and superseded by growing superior judgment. Doubtful things are all read one way, and the assured are twisted to correspond. The whole content of historic Christianity is on a basis of naturalism.



However real and universal the moral law might be for man, it might be the interpretation of evolutionary development, and have no significance for anything back of man himself. It proves nothing for the existence and authority of God, or of what is supernatural. If the miracle go, the Gospels must go too, or the critic suffer from obtuse ethics.

## II.

### GERMAN.

BY REV. S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A.M.

Grassman's pamphlet of several years ago, on *Extracts from the Moral Theology of Ligouri, which Have Been Officially Sanctioned by Popes Pius IX and Leo XIII as Norm for the Roman Catholic Church, and the Terrible Danger of This Moral Theology for the Ethics of the Nations* has occasioned quite a discussion of Roman Catholic principles and practices in morals. Of course the public mind was ready for such a discussion. The aggressive attitude of the Roman Church in Germany during the last generation, her increase in numerical strength and in political influence, the apparent failure of the Old Catholic Movement and the many victories of Ultramontaniam have served to accentuate all confessional differences, and to concentrate criticism on the weakest points of both Protestantism and Catholicism; and after Rome's doctrine of human merit, her ethics is probably her most vulnerable place.

These conditions, together with the unintended sensational character of the pamphlet, account for its enormous circulation. It has appeared in more than 104 editions, and over 320,000 copies have been printed. Grassman translates and discusses the directions given by Ligouri for priests when acting as father confessors for those who have sinned against the sixth commandment. He gives Ligouri's descriptions of the possible instances that might arise, and his directions for the priests in handling them, and asserts that in the practice of confession, when such instructions are followed, there lies a great moral



danger. It is very doubtful whether the "revelations" that he makes do more good than harm. The Nuremberg court forbade the circulation of the book, and a new, expurgated edition was announced in August. But on the other hand we must recognize the fact that it is a terrible exposure of a weak point of Rome, an exposure that is calculated to take away the nimbus that some Protestants are inclined to see about the Church that has an infallible head; it may also help the opposition to the return of the Jesuits. It has also helped the movement in the Catholic Church, which is aimed at a reform in her moral theology. There were many replies to the booklet, one from the Prince of Saxony, which thoroughly exposed Grassman's weaknesses.

---

Hermann's *Roman and Evangelical Morality* (Sec. Ed. Marburg, 1901) discusses the differences between the systems in a purely scientific manner. Werner, in September No. of *Theologische Rundschau*, sums up Hermann's argumentation in the following words: "Evangelical faith is being inwardly overcome by God, Roman faith is the decision to consider the church doctrine true, *i. e.*, external submission to a truth not produced in man himself. Accordingly the moral law, as the command of God, is for us power living within us, which rules the entire life; for the Catholic it is an externally given law, which he perceives as a burden and a limit to his freedom, analogous to the limitation of the freedom of citizens by police regulations. Consequently moral obedience, according to Rome, is only recititude in God's state; a person obeys the law so far as possible without directly breaking it. Thus there results for Hermann, as fundamental characteristics of Roman morality, lack of truth and principle." There were several replies to Hermann's book, even Mausbach's *Die Katholische Moral, ihre Methoden, Grundsätze und Aufgaben* (Cologne, 1902) was called forth by it.

Zœckler's article, *Jesuitenorden*, in the third edition of the Real-Encyclopedia, edited by Hauck, was attacked by the Jesuit priest, Reichmann, of Luxemburg.

Reichmann denied Zœckler's statement that "intentionalism

is the fundamental principle of Jesuit ethics," and claimed that it was merely a slander invented by Paschal. The expression "the end justifies the means," either in this or in another form, is not found in the works of any Jesuit. Zæckler, in his reply *Die Absichtlenkung oder der Zweck heiligt das Mittel*, maintains his former position, and asserts that, though the doctrine is not openly and directly expressed, it is contained in the Jesuit works on ethics in a concealed and indirect way, and that the whole system of Jesuitism, according to theory as well as practice, is erected on the foundation of intentionalism.

---

Graf von Hoensbrœch's fiery attack on the heart of Ultramontan-ism, the divinity of the Papacy, has awakened considerable interest in Germany during the last year, as can be judged from the fact that the first volume passed through four editions within a year, and the second volume, which appeared last May, is in the fourth edition already. At first the first volume was enthusiastically received by all, but Tschackert approved it with some hesitation, and Zæckler openly expressed his doubts, and Werner, in the *Theologische Rundschau* of September, regrets that Hoensbrœch did not show his readers to what extent his materials are historically provable; he also condemns him of attributing many things to the Papacy which are due, to a great extent, to the social and intellectual conditions of the various ages.

The purpose of Hoensbrœch is to provide "a collection of materials on the subject," which it most certainly does, for we have in it a very convenient first class work of reference on the anti-cultural activity of the Papacy and Ultramontan-ism. Even the Catholic critics could find only small errors. The correctness of his material and the reliability of his citations are unimpeachable. In making this vast collection of material that covers 1400 pages, some of which had to be sought in distant sources, the author does not aim at enriching our historical knowledge as such, but seeks to bring proof of the non-divinity of the Papacy. Since he considers the dogmatic attack from the front, on the doctrine of the divinity of the Papacy, to be of

no avail he will make an attack from the flank, and prove the non-divinity of this dogma by the undeniable facts of history. Therefore he collects the phenomena in the history of the Papacy that in no way can be harmonized with its divine character. If the Papacy were really the spiritual power in civilization that it claims to be, it would show it in the realm of social culture. The purpose of this enormous collection is to prove that the opposition is really the case. Werner doubts whether this flank attack by Hoensbroech will accomplish more than the front attack, which he seeks to surpass. However, when we remember that it is the path that led the Jesuit Hoensbroech to give up his belief in the divine authority of the Papacy, and to become the fierce polemical writer against Rome that we find in this book, it becomes plain that there is something in it.

Werner finds little in the second volume to which he can object, which deals with the ultramontane ethics, "for the responsibility of the Papacy for the Catholic literature on Ethics cannot be doubted; it results both from the ecclesiastical censorship, and, above all, from the very claim of the Papacy to be the infallible divine school-master in the realm of morals." The volume is divided into three parts; the first (1-41) gives a beautiful outline of ethics according to the Scripture; the second (42-574), the real heart of the book, is a presentation and discussion of the sources, systems and declarations of casuistic ethics; the third (585-599) measures and judges the ultramontane ethics by the standard of simple scriptural ethics, and concludes that the former is unclear, false and external.

---

Another edition of Weizsaecker's great work on *The Apostolic Age* has been published by Mohr of Leipzig. It has very few changes from the second edition, which was prepared by the author before his death and marked no change in fundamental principles from the first edition, which appeared in 1886. Weizsaecker was one of the leaders in the destructive criticism of the Apostolic Age, and has exerted considerable influence upon a number of scholars, who are still teaching in

German universities, most of whom are as liberal or even more liberal than he was. A review of the third edition in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* sums up Weizsaecker's position in the following words: "Consequently, according to Weizsaecker, the faith of the Christian Church in the resurrected Lord rests on mere illusions, for those visions of the apostles give us no guarantee of a spiritual continuation of the life of Christ. Even if a person is inclined to assume objective visions, there would be no proof that they were wrought by God. But a man must give himself over to such delusive structures of historical hypotheses, if he imagines that he must measure the ways of God with his little human understanding before he dare believe. Then even inborn piety does not prevent a man from becoming a fool in divine things."

---

Two years ago Grass published a pamphlet on *Zur Lehre von der Gottheit Christi* (Guetersloh, 1900), in which he defended the deity of Christ by the old scholastic method—by reasoning from heaven downward. Last year Schlatter, a conservative modern biblicist of Tuebingen, replied to it in *Jesu Gottheit und das Kreuz* (Bertelsmann, Guetersloh), and incidentally gave to the theological world considerable new material and, in many respects, a new method for dealing with the soteriological and christological problem. Lobstein reviewed it in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, and even he recognized the value of Schlatter's work, though, as one might expect, he regards the author's pronounced biblicism, and his treatment of the story of the passion as if it were a common canon, as great blemishes, which nullify the value of the work to a great extent, and call forth in the reader the "feeling of disappointment and uncertainty." We give Lobstein's digest in part, with extensive quotations from the work itself.

Already in examining the statement of Grass, that Jesus was placed by God in the position of God-forsakenness, which disturbed fellowship with God He brought to an end, and thereby showed His deity, Schlatter takes occasion to set forth valuable fundamental principles for methodology and dogmatics. "Such

a fundamental declaration as the affirmation of the deity of the Crucified One, which determines our entire conception of God and the world, and fundamentally transforms that which makes up our religiousness, and thereby becomes the source and center of our thinking and willing, should not be hung on an individual fact or passage of Scripture, so that it appears to be moved by every variation of historico-exegetical investigation and discussion, and changes with every judgment concerning an exegetical detail. A power which makes us ask in astonishment, For what? is not manifest as a power of God; as such it is manifest in the value (Werth) which it procures. Jesus' deity is not manifest in this, that he did not perish in suffering, but in the fact that his cross is of value and efficient for the world before the Father" (11, 9-10, 20-21). Instead of formulating the question according to scholastic view points, as did Grass, he chooses the other statement of the problem: "Does the reasons for affirming Christ's deity lie in His Cross, or can it not be found there and must it be sought elsewhere?" (30).

Schlatter first approaches the answering of this problem from the biblico-theological side. Chapter II treats of *The Participation of the Deity of Jesus in His Death according to the Gospels* (30-37). The scholastic method of Grass is rejected and attention is called to the fact that the "eye of the New Testament teachers is directed to their one invisible Lord; they hear him in his Word, not now his humanity and then his deity; they see him in his works, not now his divinity and then again his humanity" (30). Exegesis of passages from John, Paul and the Letter to the Hebrews leads to the conclusion: "There is no divided deity in the apostles. If the Father's will and act is recognized, the meaning and work of deity is clear. But that Jesus took part in the work of God only in a passive way, and entered into our class as the first recipient of grace, is, within the apostles' word, forever excluded by the name, Christ. For by this he was declared to be not the Receiver of but the Giver of grace, and the Worker of the divine will" (37).

Chapter III deals with *The Relation of the Apostolical Declaration to the Formulas of the Church* (37-38). Under this title the author considers the expressions of the apostles in reference to the three formulas, which Grass selected from the doctrinal tradition of the Church, and which he characterizes by the names, Origen, Anselm and the Heidelberg Catechism. Schlatter seeks to show that these expressions of the apostles offer parallels to the three formulas. "The apostolic teaching concerning the cross does not lead us to a choice from among the three, but to a purification, a perfection and a union of them" (48). "Our Greek-trained fathers have speculated boldly and cleverly, and often naively. They all ask, as does Grass, Why must Jesus be God-man? since the perception that he is falls far short of the goal of knowledge, which is only attained when *being* has been raised for our vision into *must be*. These conclusions, made from above downwards, which begin in the eternal will of God in order to lay hold of that which has happened at its very roots, and to take their stand in the other world, are the exclusive possession of our fathers, and are not to be carried back into the expressions of Jesus, which were very far from such efforts that serve only knowledge; nor are they contained in the doctrinal sections of the apostolic documents, which never draw the gaze away from God's completed act; nor can we repeat them, for thereby there would be artificially conserved, a form of logic now lost to us. Therefore, with the fathers, we continually have the task of separating the substance of their thought from its deductive formulation and disfiguration, and to measure it according to its real certainty of proof, independent of the form in which they have and give it. Only within these limits can we speak of a 'scripturalness' in the reflections of Origen and Anselm; but within these limitations must their relation to the content of Scripture necessarily be discussed" (38-29).

"The doctrinal expressions of the apostles direct us to the story of the cross. Through that which presents this to our view is decided whether and how the divinity of Jesus becomes knowable to us in the picture of the cross" (48). This sentence

opens the fourth chapter, which deals with, *The will of Jesus to Be Saviour and to Die on the Cross* (48-69). The author establishes the equalization, expressed here, by facts that belong in the realm of religious psychology, but which should be regulated by the story of the passion always represented to the eye of faith. Schlatter seeks to express both the analogy, that connects Jesus' dying with our dying, and the peculiarity of the Saviour's death, which is bound with that analogy in an indissoluble unity. But his expressions, owing to his struggling with such a ponderous subject, become heavy and dark at times. From the result attained, Schlatter again views the three groups of formulas, the value of which in terms of truth he undertakes to examine. The title of the faith chapter is; *Relation of the Church Formulas to the Story of the Passion*. He attempts to find out from the New Testament teaching concerning the Cross the elements that are diversely expressed in the Church formulas, and even here comes to the goal already aimed at, that the content of the three forms of doctrinal statement mentioned can be brought to its unity and truth by the biblical thought, and can be freed from onesidedness and inaccuracies still clinging to it.

The closing chapter treats of *The Power of the Crucified One to Save*. "Our looking up to God springs from the announcing of the story of the Cross. That which we possess of the divine, the looking up to God that we have, the Spirit in which we pray and love, becomes ours through the word that tells of the Crucified One. Therein is revealed the power of the Cross, but also with it the deity of Him who died on it, in an attestation that shines through all ages" (90).

Schlatter's departure from the traditional method becomes all the more interesting when we remember that he is classed among the most conservative of the leading theologians of Germany of to-day. He stands for a very positive type of Christianity and is one of the bitterest opponents of the destructive criticism of the present. This pamphlet is only one of many expressions from conservatives of discontent with the methods that have been pursued in the past. The theological thought



of the last thirty years has lead Schlatter to write in a way that would have been considered decidedly Ritschlian in trend by Ritschl's chief opponents during the late seventies. Yet Schlatter and those of like mind will insist that they are not less conservative than their predecessors of a former generation. They think the same thoughts, but they think them differently, they hold the same fundamental truths, but they derive and defend them in another age; and they find some things, in the old man-made forms, which are wholly of human origin and are no more a part of the truth that is exhibited than the mounting is a part of the jewel, and they feel that they can treat these human elements as best suits the thought-world of to day.

But then the great question arises, which can never be definitively answered, where does the human element stop and the divine begin? Some assert an independent attitude toward traditional dogma only in a few unimportant details; others go so far as to claim that even the New Testament contains a great deal of man-made dogmatics, *e. g.*, the pre-existence of Christ, His deity and resurrection, which they can accept or reject as they choose. Between these two extremes are found all the various shades of theological tendencies that make up the confused theological world of to day. At present conservative theologians seem to be concluding that more remnants of Greek philosophy and scholasticism cling to our dogmas than the conservatives of a former generation were willing to admit; and the liberal or negative theologians, with ears itching as ever for some new thing, seem to be seeking new focus points and appear to have found one in the so-called religious-historical method, which in its fully developed form denies all objective revelation and regards man as the maker of his own religion. Judging from the history of theological tendencies and schools of the last centuries, we are justified in expecting the left wing to resolve itself into irreligious anti-revelational ethical systems, while the right wing of the tendency will ever more and more approach traditional conservatism, realizing that Christianity without a real Saviour from real sin is impossible.



## ARTICLE XI.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO., BOSTON, MASS.

*Jesus' Way.* By William DeWitt Hyde, President of Bowdoin College.  
Pp. xii and 198. Price \$1.00 net. 16mo., cloth, gilt top.

President Hyde presents under the happily chosen title, *Jesus' Way*, what he conceives to be the original and simple teaching of Jesus imbedded in the Synoptic Gospels. He endeavors to divest it from the "alloy" of picture, parable, and miracle, and to set it forth in language of today. He designates Christianity by the name by which it was spoken of by the apostles, *The Way*. "Jesus' Way is simply one of many possible ways in which a man may live." In a dozen chapters the essentials of this Way are described.

There is much that is true and beautiful in this book. Some of the chapters, like that on "Love: the Law of the Way," are very fine. But no man has ever yet re-written the Gospels and added to their charm or authenticity. It is doubtful whether the Way can be more plainly and impressively set forth than the Evangelists have done. We are sure that the latter never taught the fundamental errors which make President Hyde's book dangerous. To him the doctrines of total depravity and original sin are simply the inventions of "those slanderers of the race, the theologians." He is evidently unitarian in belief, for the worship of Jesus is simply "ethical," while the Holy Spirit is "the life and will of the Father, reproduced in the Son." His definition of faith is vague. It is simply "the recognition of goodness outside us." We fear, therefore, that if any one should substitute the teachings of this book for those of the Gospels he would sadly miss that Way, which is also Truth and Life.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Blue Flower.* By Henry Van Dyke.

The announcement of a new book from the pen of Dr. Van Dyke is always hailed with delight by a large circle of his admirers, for no one has more rapidly gained a hold on the reading public than he has done. In the other books he has written the chief charm is his keen and perfectly expressed appreciation of nature, but this new venture is entirely unlike those, for here his imagination has been given full sway and his flights of fancy are what gives to the book its great attractiveness. It has been said that a writer's style is soon recognized but we are slow to think that any one who has read "Fisherman's Luck" would attribute "The Blue Flower" to the same author.

Nine stories comprise this book, and they are full of beauty. The keynote of them is a short translation from the German of Novalis called "The Blue Flower." It is all in all "the story of the search for happiness, which is life," that runs through these nine stories. The book deserves all the popularity it has already won and all that may follow.

P. M. BIKLE.

Never before has the *Atlantic Monthly* offered such attractions as it does for 1903. It has certainly been with the greatest care that the arrangements have been made for giving to its readers such choice contributions. Arthur Sherburne Hardy, our Minister to Spain, will contribute the chief serial "Daphne, an Autumn Pastoral," by Margaret Sherwood will appear as a short serial. Under the title of "The Life of the American Citizen" the Atlantic will print a group of papers. Institutions as varied as the School, the Church, and the Stock Exchange, professions as far apart as the Law and that of the Trained Nurse, will be examined with a view to noting their effect upon the current experience and character of the American of to-day.

The first of these articles will be devoted to "The School" and will be written by President Eliot of Harvard.

Sir Leslie Stephen, formerly editor of the Cornhill Magazine, is expected to contribute a "Group of Reminiscent Papers" dealing with Englishmen of letters during the last half century.

John Townsend Trowbridge, one of the two surviving contributors to the first number of the Atlantic, has written his autobiography under the title of "My Own Story" and it will appear during the year in the Atlantic.

Mark Antony De Wolf Howe, author of "American Bookmen", will contribute a short series of papers. Among the leaders of American academic thought who will contribute during the coming year are: Woodrow Wilson, President of Princeton University, on "Ideals of the Republic"; Arthur W. Hadley, President of Yale University, on "Academic Freedom"; William De Witt Hyde, President of Bowdoin College, on "The New Ethics"; John Bascom, of Williams College, on "Changes in Fifty Years in College Life."

These are by no means all the attractive features that the *Atlantic Monthly* has to offer for 1903 and it promises to be the year which will even surpass all that we have had from this best of all American magazines.

P. M. BIKLE.

#### LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY

*The Lutheran Pastor.* By G. H. Gerberding D. D., Professor of Practical Theology in the Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Chicago, Ill. Author of "The Way of Salvation in the Lutheran Church," "New Testament Conversions," etc. Pp. 462. Price \$2.25.

We heartily welcome this book. It is written by a Lutheran, from a Lutheran standpoint and for Lutheran pastors, though it may be read with equal profit by ministers of all Churches. It is especially adapted to the pastors of the Lutheran Church in this country because it unfolds and enforces the duties of the pastoral offices as these are suggested and conditioned by the life of the Church in a free land.

The discussion embraces a wide range of topics. It begins with "The Pastor's Office and Call," then takes up in order "The Pastor as a Man," "The Pastor's General Work," "The Pastor in the Sanctuary," and "The Pastor's Private Work," and ends with "The Pastor's Relation to Synod and Conference and his Vacation." These outlines afford ample scope for the introduction and consideration of all the varied duties and obligations that arise from the relation of pastor and people, and the presentation of them is clear, direct, and thorough.

We are especially pleased with the author's views regarding the "Inner or Preparatory Call." This call, he tells us, is not a mere preference or earnest desire for the profession of the ministry, but "a clear and heartfelt conviction, wrought by the Holy Ghost, that it is God's will that he should serve Him in his holy office." Of course this call is ratified when he is chosen by a congregation to be its pastor and is ordained. In Infant Baptism the questions are to be addressed to the parents and not to the child. The practice of having sponsors receives but scant encouragement, the parents themselves being regarded as the natural and proper guardians of the spiritual interests of the child. In the services of the Sanctuary preaching is the principal thing; the true order is observed and enjoined: The Word and the Sacraments, not the Sacraments and the Word. Moreover, throughout the entire volume the writer is constantly warning against formalism. He is keenly alive to the proneness of the human heart to substitute the punctilious performance of religious duties for religion itself, the observances of rites and ceremonies for a living faith in Christ. When speaking of Baptism, the Preparatory Service, the Holy Communion, he admonishes the pastor again and again to guard against their formal use by the people. All this is sound Lutheran teaching.

On page 325 the author speaks of our confirmed young people straying off to other denominations and the consequent losses which our Church is constantly sustaining. In seeking for the causes of this defection, he says, among other things: "We believe that it lies in an unspiritual ministry. We have too much dead orthodoxism: too much lifeless formalism: too much mechanical and professional school-master work in the catechetical class." These are plain words. No doubt this long tried and divinely owned method of indoctrinating the young may be abused. The pastor may think the chief end of catechising has been attained when the catechism has been "learned," that is, when its contents have been memorised. Such a course develops

the memory, but it ignores the spiritual nature. The hungry heart is neglected, and when its famished cry can no longer be killed, there is a turning to other denominations for that which has been denied it in its own Church.

There are some things in this otherwise excellent work to which we cannot give our assent. On the subject of Evangelism Loehe's assertion that "the distinctive office of the New Testament evangelist was limited to the apostolic time" is quoted approvingly. To this the author adds: "It needs no argument to show that the modern, so-called, self-appointed evangelist is no successor to the bearer of this New Testament office and cannot claim him as a prototype." We beg leave to differ. It needs considerable argument to prove that every modern evangelist is doing an unscriptural work. If all evangelistic effort is wrong, then the Lord, we say it with reverence, made a mistake when he blessed the labors of Moody, and is making a mistake when he blesses the labors of evangelistic laymen in Germany to-day.

On page 330, the author, in speaking of the Holy Communion, says: "It is not the pastor's table—if it were he might do as he pleases with his own, but it is the Lord's table," to all of which we give our hearty assent. But when in the next sentence he inquires: "What right has he to invite anyone except on the conditions which the Lord himself lays down?" and makes this condition to consist in attendance upon a Preparatory Service, we ask, where in all the New Testament has the Lord laid down the condition that in order to come to his table one must first attend a Preparatory Service in a Lutheran church? Further on he quotes Mueller who says: "He (the pastor) has no right to narrow or change the Lord's conditions, which are repentance and faith," but the author surely cannot mean that repentance and faith are to be found and exercised only at a Preparatory Service? We believe in confession and absolution before communion, but we also accept what Luther says, "Although I do not force, yet I advise that they gladly confess before going to Sacrament. I, Doctor Martin, myself sometimes go without having confessed lest I lay a necessary custom on my conscience, yet I use confession and will not be deprived of it, chiefly on account of absolution which is the Word of God."

When describing the pastor's entrance into the chancel to commence the services, the author says, "Step slowly, be dignified, quiet and reverential in all your movements, deliberate, devout and distinct in utterance," all of which is good, wholesome advice. Then he adds, "offer silent prayer, standing with face towards the altar," We can understand why the pastor should be "dignified, devout and step slowly," but we do not understand and are not told why he should "face the altar," when offering silent prayer. Is there anything about the altar, or upon it or within it that he should face towards it? Is the altar in the Christian Church more sacred than the baptismal font or the pulpit or

the lectern? Is it unscriptural to face in any other direction? We wish the writer had enlightened us on this point.

But while we offer these criticisms, not in a spirit of fault-finding but because the points criticised are a defect and blemish, we nevertheless cordially commend the book and express the hope that it may find its way into the hands more especially of our theological students, to whom its faithful perusal will prove very profitable.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

*History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina* In commemoration of the first century of its existence. By G. D. Bernheim, D.D., and George H. Cox, D.D. Pp. 191.

The North Carolina Synod has had such a conspicuous part in the planting and development of Lutheranism in the United States that its history is a matter of primary importance. It is now about completing its first century, having been organized in 1803, and it pursued a wise course in resolving to publish its own history as part of its centennial commemoration. It did a wise thing, too in committing the work to Drs. Bernheim and Cox. They have done their work with conscientious care and the product before us ought to prove highly satisfactory, not only to the Synod but to the Church at large.

Starting with the early colonial history of the Lutheran Church in North Carolina, dating its beginning in 1747, the authors give an account of the life and labors of the first Lutheran ministers, and the causes that led to the organization of the Synod. We then find chapters on its confessional history; its territory and growth; the noted rupture of 1820; its license system; its connection with the general bodies; its educational work, Sunday-school work, missionary operations, and its attitude towards liturgical forms of service. Considerable space is given to sketches of all the congregations now in connection with the Synod. These sketches are followed by tabulated statements of the ministers that have been in connection with that body, its growth in the number of ministers, its parochial and financial reports, its officers and places of meeting, closing with a statistical table of the woman's missionary society.

It is a good work well done. We may say, also, that it is well printed, and shows that the publication house in Philadelphia can make a most creditable showing in comparison with the leading publishing houses of our country. Copies of this excellent and valuable work can be purchased from Rev. V. Y. Boozer, Salisbury, N. C.

P. M. BIKLE.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA AND LONDON.

*Four Princes, or the Growth of a Kingdom.* A story of the Christian Church centered around four types. By James A. B. Scherer, Ph. D., Founder of the Evangelical Lutheran Mission in Japan, teacher in

the Theological Seminary of the United Synod, and pastor of St. Andrew's church, Charleston, S. C. Price, \$1.25 net. Pp. 276.

To the busy man who has the time only for an outline history of the Church this is the very book he wants. He will find it but an outline and yet comprehensive enough to give him a satisfactory story of the Church's planting and growth—a story made exceedingly fascinating by the manner of its telling. The facts are grouped around four concrete figures—Paul, Constantine, Bernard and Luther—the first standing for the seed time, the second (for a parallelism of Mark 4 : 26-28) representing the blade, the third the hidden ear, and the fourth the ripening corn. The author himself puts it so well in his "foreword" that we reproduce it :

"The first of them belonged to the apostolic age ; the second, to the fourth Christian century ; the third, to the middle ages ; and the last, to the Reformation. All of these belong to all time. The first was a scholar and an artisan ; the second an emperor and a warrior ; while the third and the last were monks. Considered nationally, they represent the four great racial influences that have successively given to the Church its human form: the first was a Jew, the second a Græco-Roman, the third a Franco-Italian, and the fourth a Teuton. Considered typically, they represent four of the most influential types among the workers of God's Kingdom,—Missionary, ruler, mystic, and reformer."

The method of treating church history in this way is a most happy one and Dr. Scherer has worked it successfully. Reading church history is suggestive of "dry" reading, but the reading of this book will be found full of fascinating interest. As a piece of literary composition, too, it is of the best grade—the author proving himself a master of perspicuous and expressive diction. Among the best books that have appeared for a year or more the "Four Princes" deserves, in our judgment, a pre-eminent place.

P. M. BIKLE.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

*St. Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles.* By P. A. Peter, Evangelical Lutheran Minister, author of a History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century.

This Book consists of a series of letters supposed to have been written by Alexander of Damascus to his friend, Manasseh, in Alexandria relating the most important events in the life of St. Paul. The life, teachings and labors of the great apostle are set forth in this form in the belief that thereby the narrative will be made more life-like and realistic. The subject is divided into three periods—from Pentecost to Paul's conversion—from his conversion to his last Journey to Jerusalem and from that to his Martyrdom at Rome. Nineteen letters are

devoted to these three periods—six to the first, eight to the second and five to the third.

A full outline of the contents of these letters is given at the beginning of the book, covering eight pages. This analysis is in itself of great value as it not only enables the reader to find the place in the book where any particular subject is presented but also to take the facts and ideas that the author has furnished in the body of the work.

By comparing the book with the purpose expressed by the author in the preface it is very plain that he has fully accomplished what he set out to perform and has given us a great deal of most valuable information concerning the character, views and services of this most remarkable servant of Jesus Christ and has put that information into a form that the reading of it is easy and pleasant as well as instructive and edifying. Altogether we regard it as a very useful book and commend it heartily to all classes of readers.

E. HUBER.

B. W. HUEBSCH, 150 NASSAU ST., NEW YORK.

*A Book of Meditations.* By Edward Howard Griggs, with portrait of the author by Albert Stevens. Pp. 226.

In this book is comprised a series of short essays, some of the length of a paragraph, others of several pages. The range of subjects is broad and diverse.

The author calls these short articles "meditations." We think that the second person may call them essays; for out of the heart of nearly everyone the reader can pluck a definite topic—a central thought about which the author says something. To be sure, they are sometimes introspective; but their subjectiveness is of that sane and universal sort that may belong to any of us. According to the caption of these essays, they have been written at various times remote from each other and in all sorts of places, from Scranton, Pa., in the United States, to Assisi. They are critical, descriptive, moral, literary and occasionally religious. All have in them the poetical and artistic quality to such a striking degree that we might say that the constituency of the book would be a small and choice one. Yet Mr. Griggs' English is so clear and accurate, and his style so simple, his change of subject so frequent, that even a dull person may imagine that they see with his eyes and think his thoughts after him. We have said that Mr. Griggs' prose is poetical; yet his work suffers decided loss when it takes the form of poetry as it does in various places throughout the book. He is at his best in the fine prose style which seems natural to him. After all Mr. Griggs' thoughts are not lyrical in character, and perhaps the reader of this review can best judge of their rather original style by the following quotations. In a paragraph, written in Paris, he speaks thus of the Ministry of nature: "How remote are the high mountains from the activities of a great city! Where men are heaped together the



swarm of restless life absorbs one's attention and destroys the perspective of the spirit. It becomes necessary to go away from it all to feel the lifting power of the unshackled and serene nature-world.

The very absence of moral possibility in Nature makes her influence profoundly calming and uplifting to the spirit of man. The peace of the countless centuries of quiet and unconscious growth contrasts with the haste and sin and pain of human life.

There is thus a ministry of nature, the function of which increases steadily with the refining of life. One must ever go back to the great realities of human life, so we must return to our Nature-mother, who knows when her child would be charmed with the music of her myriad voices, and when, wearied with the glare and the stress of the pitiless day, he longs to rest his tired head in the sweet Lethe he finds on her breast."

Again we quote: "St. Francis is a rare example of a man living out his inspiration where it comes to him. Usually the prophet must go far away, that physical distance may make possible an appreciation of his greatness. Familiarity is an inseparable obstacle to giving a lofty message. No good comes out Nazereth, and Nazereth is always the place where we live. 'Why,' we say, 'we knew his father, what can this son of a carpenter know that we do not know; whence comes any unusual message from him?' And so God's miracles go on, unseen because of their very nearness.

It is to the remote we look for a revelation, while all the time it would speak to us from the eyes of those who are near us and would voice itself through the commonplace world in which we live. St. Francis is one great example of a life so utterly and consistently consecrated to a noble aim as to compel appreciation from those immediately about him."

Again he writes in London: "One should have the greater simplicity of physical habits combined with the largest flexibility. How hard the combination is to attain, and yet how important to a life at once sane and full! It is the same problem present everywhere in living—the problem of unstable equilibrium—of an adjustment that is ever in process and never crystallized."

But we could quote pages of valuable matter, some of it finely dramatic, always looked at directly with keen artistic eye and reverent attitude of mind and expressed with the simplicity and truth of the artist's speech. We have been particularly impressed with the few words on "Evolution," "Faith," "Duty," "From Night to Night," "The Alps." Any thoughtful person will enjoy this book.

M. E. RICHARD.

PERRY MASON COMPANY, BOSTON.

*The Youth's Companion.* This excellent periodical for young people, so helpful and full of interest to them hitherto, gives promise of even better things for 1903. It will have six serial stories, each a



book in itself, reflecting American life in home, camp and field; fifty special articles contributed by famous men and women—travelers essayists, soldiers, sailors, statesmen and men of affairs; more than two hundred short stories by the best living story writers; and thousands of short notes on current events and discoveries in the field of science and industry, besides many thoughtful and timely editorial articles on important public and domestic questions. It is highly valuable too for its weekly summary of important news. Its weekly article on hygiene is of the utmost value for preserving the health of the household. It is a paper primarily for young people, but it has thousands of readers among those no longer young, and this because of its own merit. Well invested is the \$1 75 sent as the subscription price for one year to the *Youth's Companion*, 144 Berkeley street, Boston, Mass.

*Lutheran Calendar.* Published by the Luther League Review, P. O. Box 876, New York City. Price twenty-five cents.

A Calendar giving 365 notable dates which mark the founding of the many Lutheran enterprises and institutions in Foreign Missions, Home Missions, Inner Missions, Deaconess Works, Schools of Learning, Homes of Mercy, etc., in all parts of the world. Very valuable and instructive.

*Der Zionsbote. Ein Christliche Volks-Kalendar.* By the German Literary Board of the Lutheran Wartburg and Nebraska Synods. R. Neuman, Burlington, Ia. Pp. 104. Besides the usual matter belonging to almanacs this calendar contains illustrations of prominent Lutheran churches in the West. A number of devotional articles and the P. O. address of Lutheran Ministers.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

**50 YEARS' EXPERIENCE**

# PATENTS

**TRADE MARKS  
DESIGNS  
COPYRIGHTS &C.**

Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. Handbook on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents.

Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice, without charge, in the

## Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, \$3 a year: four months, \$1. Sold by all newdealers.

**MUNN & Co. 361 Broadway, New York**  
Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.